UNCOVERING

THE FORCES FOR WAR

by

Conrad K. Grieb

EXAMINER BOOKS
P. O. Box 144—Station Y
NEW YORK 21, N. Y.

Copyright, 1947

by

Conrad K. Grieb

New York, N. Y.

All Rights Reserved

Price
One Dollar

DEDICATION

To those many Americans who are seeking a firmer factual footing in the mire of misinformation that covers the world today, this study is respectfully dedicated.

Truth

"The supreme freedom is the freedom of the people to know the truth. For the peace and prosperity of the world it is more important for the public to know the liberal truth than the reactionary truth. Perhaps some day all of us will be strong enough to stand the real truth."—Henry A. Wallace, former vice-president of the United States (New York Times, January 7, 1947).

Mr. Wallace, perhaps unintentionally, has said something of great importance in these words. If he really meant it when he said the supreme freedom is the freedom of the people to know the truth, then he must agree that it is vitally important for *all possible sides of the truth* to be presented to the people. To suppress one truth and let the people know only the other truth—Mr. Wallace admits in the words quoted above there are two truths, the liberal and the reactionary —then, it must seem to every fair-minded person, the people will get only a one-sided truth, and they will never acquire the strength, which Mr. Wallace evidently considers most desirable, to know the real truth.

In the following pages, therefore, the reader will find some uncontestable truths which may prove to be vitally necessary to his understanding of the real truth.

Foreword

Despite all the propaganda efforts made by the protagonists of the shibboleth of Democracy two world wars in a generation have left the world not better off, but worse. And the propagandists for Democracy cannot change that fact, no matter what they do.

They can place the blame where they will, almost without opposition, because of their monopoly of the public opinion *manufacturing* agencies. And by constant repetition they can have most of the people believing them.

But here, the author challenges the monopolists of public opinion by examining unpublicized material —unpublicized because this material reveals the UNDER COVER FORCES FOR WAR.

February 1, 1947

ANONYMITY

"So you see, my dear Coningsby, the world is governed by very different personages from what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes."—Coningsby (page 233, Century Edition, 1903) by Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield.

(First published in 1844)

Contents

Foreword
1. British-American Rapprochement 1
2. British-German Cleavage 7
3. "Roping in America"—1917 15
4. Twenty Years Armistice 27
5. "Roping in America"—1941 49
6. Other Influences 73
7. Conclusions 89

Appendices:
- No. I President Lincoln and the International Bankers of His Day 91
- No. II British Concentration Camps In the Boer War 93
- No. III The War in South Africa, by J. A. Hobson 95
- No. IV Democracy and Social Instability, by J. Middleton Murry 99
- No. V Winston Churchill in India 101
- No. VI Winston Churchill on War 101
- No VII Walter Rathenau Predicted Germany Today 103
- No. VIII Austria Before Hitler, by Dr. Joseph Eberle 104
- No. IX Danzig and The Corridor, by W. H. Dawson 106
- No. X Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith 107
- No. XI Theodore Herzl Confutes Nathan Ohrbach 108

Bibliography 110
Index 112
Books For Collateral Reading 117

"One does not need to be endowed with an abnormally vivid imagination in order to foresee that for us to guarantee Germany's Eastern frontier would be an act of sheer criminal lunacy."—R. W. Walmsley, London Economist, 14th Nov. 1931 (p. 914).

Sir Walter Layton, M.A., C.B.E., Editor of The Economist, commented on the letter above as follows:

"We are apt to judge, when we look into the East Europe settlement, that its terms are inequitable and they ought not to be perpetuated even if they could be." (Page 899.)

CHAPTER ONE

British-American Rapprochement

"Time may dispel many pleasing illusions and destroy many noble dreams but it will never shake my belief that the wound caused by the wholly unlooked for and undesired separation of the Mother from her child is not to bleed forever. Let men say what they will, therefore I say, that surely as the sun in the heavens once shown upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon, and greet again the united states, the British American Union."—Andrew Carnegie.

With this thought Andrew Carnegie closed the 1893 edition of his book "Triumphant Democracy." Significantly, you will look in vain for these concluding words in later editions which omit entirely the last chapter, "The Re-union of Britain and America."

Force had not succeeded in bringing about the reunion of the mother with her child, so ardently looked forward to by Carnegie. Two military adventures on the Western shore of the Atlantic by Britain had ended in failure.

During the Civil War:

"England and America were brought to the verge of war by the affair 'Trent' and later by the building of Confederate vessels in English yards."[1]

And then, with the assassination of President Lincoln,[2] the British policy towards America changed to one of friendliness. It would not be difficult to find authoritative evidence that the reconciliation was actually between American banking institutions and the banking interests in England, rather than between the peoples of the two countries. Hilaire Belloc in MONARCHY, A

1. American Political History, Viola Conklin, page 402.
2. See Appendix I.

STUDY OF LOUIS XIV, writing of the influence of the money power, states in the preface:

> "Those who omit it—omit the one thing salient, the one thing omission of which renders their judgment worthless."

At the turn of the century the policy of reconciliation had so far advanced that Professor Dicey recommended the establishment of a common citizenship.[3] The Anglo-American League, a society formed in London in the summer of 1898 consisting of representative individuals chosen from all grades of social, political, civil, and commercial life, adopted the following resolutions:

> "Considering that the people of the British Empire and of the United States of America are closely allied in blood, inherit the same principles of self-government, recognize the same ideals of freedom and humanity in the guidance of their national policy, and are drawn together by strong common interests in many parts of the world, this meeting is of the opinion that every effort should be made, in the interests of civilization and peace to secure the most cordial and constant co-operation between the two nations."

That program of "cordial and constant co-operation between the two nations" brought not peace but the most destructive wars of the modern era.

The astute British diplomatists had appraised the growing strength of English-speaking America and sought by every means to involve their former colony, now grown strong, in an imperialist policy so that in times of crisis British and American interests would be so intertwined as to be one.

Of Theodore Roosevelt, who had become President when McKinley died by an assassin's bullet, William Morton Fullerton, correspondent of The Times (London), writes:

3. The Contemporary Review Advertiser, April, 1897, page 212.

> "His coming was the arrival of the magician who made America to loom over the top of the sea, and finally to become visible from Madrid, Paris, Berlin and London, and even from China and from the islands of the Pacific."[1]

Theodore Roosevelt's arbitration of the Morocco dispute between the great powers of Europe was a step on the way to participation in European affairs which Fullerton describes as:

> ". . . often the blind but consecutive effort to shatter German hegemony, and to establish equilibrium among the Great Powers."[2]

The scholarly John R. Dos Passos, a New York attorney for commercial interests of his day, writes glowingly of the unification of the English-speaking people:

> "When the sun disappeared on the last day of the Nineteenth Century it left in the horizon vivid pictures of two unexpected and incomplete events whose influence will penetrate far into the realm of future history and throw light upon the great records which will be made in this new century. In one picture, the United States of America was seen fighting in the Philippines for the possession of a land which she claimed by double title of conquest and purchase. In the other, the British Empire was battling with the Boers: sending her armies over the seas into Africa, to answer the defiant and goading challenge of that people.
>
> "Neither the acquisition by the United States of new territories, conquered or purchased, from a weaker power, nor the subjugation of the Boers by England and the enforcement of absolute sovereignty upon their republics are, per se, events of supreme importance to the outside world.
>
> "The continental powers view with comparative complacency the relinquishment of the sovereignty

1. Problems of Power, page 24, 2 page 25.

of Spain over the Philippines, Cuba, and Puerto Rico; and while the subjugation of the Boers, and the metamorphosis of their republics into the colonies of the British Empire, awakens keener interest and criticism, these acts will, nevertheless, pass unchallenged, and eventually be acquiesced in."[1]

"But the deep significance of these two historic incidents is, that they have brought the English-American peoples into such striking prominence that their present and future relations to each other and the aim and scope of their ambition, separately or combined, must become an absorbing topic of international thought and discussion." (Pages 1-2.)
(The Anglo-Saxon Century.)

Dos Passos continues on Page 49:

"The existing feeling among the people calling for a near and closer relationship of the English-speaking race is the recognition of this evolution.

"The belief that steps should be taken to put this feeling into some practical and tangible shape does not emanate from one country, but it comes from both. It springs not from official or diplomatic sources; it is the spontaneous utterance of the people of both countries.

"The peculiar, isolated fact which brought this question to light, and to the attention of the two nations, was the Spanish-America War. The *moral* support which England gave to America in that struggle caused it to develop, and brought about its further propagation. England's position in that war was not manifested in any official or recognized diplomatic manner, but, by some language, intimation, or action known and understood in the courts of Europe, the continental powers were made to understand that she would permit no interference with the United States in the conduct of the war."

1. Jean Carrere, correspondent of Le Temps, writes, "Captain G., an English officer, told him at Bloemfontein: 'It is, however, in order to give gold to some financiers, at present one knows not where sheltered, that the soldiers of Great Britain have come here.'" See Appendices II, III.

This worthy scholar relied on surface indications to reveal the shape of passing events. He did not observe that the surface, aside from revealing the shape of things, also conceals the contents. More alert observers have gone beneath surface observations to give us this more complete understanding of realities:

"A word here as to the British role in our acquisition of the Philippines is necessary to get a rounded picture of what Bemis (author of Diplomatic History of the U. S.) calls 'The Greatest Mistake In the History of American Diplomacy.'

"The British were very much worried that Germany would take over the Philippine Islands. As Germany was becoming a stronger rival of Britain in all parts of the world, this was the last thing the British wanted to happen.

"Furthermore, the British wanted the United States to take a physical place in the Far East where it might support British policy to keep China open to Western trade, which was predominantly British trade. If the British could manoeuver us into not only an increasing trade stake but actual territory in the Far East, it would be much easier for Britain to obtain American co-operation in helping Britain preserve her Far Eastern stake, which was becoming more and more menaced by Germany and others."—(WHY MEDDLE IN THE ORIENT, Boake Carter and Thomas Healy, p. 61.)

What has been the result?

". . . while American men fought the Japanese, Imperialism marched on behind. Imperialism raised the British flag on Guadalcanal, after our men took it; Imperialism raised the British flag at Tarawa—after our men took it; Imperialism raised the Dutch flag at New Hollandia—after our men took it. Im-

perialism waits, from Hong Kong to Singapore, to raise its empire-flags—and we at home are told to scrap synthetic rubber plants."—(AMERICA . . . WHICH WAY? p. 35, John Howland Snow.)

In addition to the "vivid pictures of two unexpected and incompleted events" of which Mr. Dos Passos writes "when the sun disappeared on the last day of the Nineteenth Century," the figures of two famous empire builders, Cecil Rhodes and Andrew Carnegie, silhouetted boldly on the sky-line, cast their shadows across the years to the present time.

Cecil Rhodes, in the first of his several wills, had already visualized a society, which he was later to finance, known as the Rhodes Scholarship Fund. Its purpose was to imbue talented young Americans, fitted for leadership, with ambition to devote their efforts in the fulfillment of Rhodes' dream of a British-American Union.

The first draft of Rhodes' will directed that a secret society should be endowed with the following objects:

> "The extension of British rule throughout the world . . . the colonization by British subjects of all land where the means of livelihood are attainable by energy, labor and enterprise, and especially the occupation by British settlers of the entire continent of Africa, the Holy Land, the Valley of the Euphrates, the islands of Cyprus and Candia, the whole of South America, the islands of the Pacific not heretofore possessed by Great Britain, the whole of the Malay Archipelago, the seaboard of China and Japan, *the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire* . . . (Italics ours.—Ed.)[1]
>
> "Fantastic dream? Fantastic as the design appears it already has been largely fulfilled. The Holy Land, the Valley of the Euphrates, all of the islands of the Pacific south of the equator, Candia and Cyprus and most of the continent of Africa are now under British control. It is no fantastic dream. Startling progress has been made towards Anglicizing American colleges, school textbooks, the lecture platform, the pulpit, the press and other channels of public education."—(The Poisoned Loving Cup, pp. 112-113, Charles Grant Miller.)

1. Cecil Rhodes, page 50, Basil Williams.

The campaign to "rope in America" was in full swing at the turn of the century. Backed by the gigantic private fortunes of two men—the one, a patriotic Englishman who sought the recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire; the other, an American of Scottish birth who remained a British patriot at heart, and longed for the day to greet again the united states, the British-American Union—funds are never lacking to beguile the American people into willingly serving the needs of the Empire with their blood and their fortunes. A recent traveler to England, whose identity must remain unknown, found that America is still regarded in London as the best colony.

CHAPTER TWO

British-German Cleavage

"Il est dans mon systeme d'affaibler la Prusse; je veux qu'elle ne soit puissance dans le balance polique de l'Europe."*—Napoleon at Tilsit in conversation with Tsar Alexander and the King of Prussia.

During the years before the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, Britain allowed it to appear that it was her support France and Russia sought for war against Germany. Actually, her diplomatists, with characteristic shrewdness, were using France and Russia in Britain's traditional Continental Balance of Power Policy.

Colonel E. M. House, President Wilson's roving diplomat, sent a dispatch to the President dated May 29, 1914:

"Whenever England consents, France and Russia will close in on Germany and Austria."—(Intimate Papers of Colonel House, Vol. I, p. 249.)

Russia was evidently fearful that consent might not be given. Benckendorff, Russian ambassador in London, in a communication to Sazanov, Russian Foreign Minister, wrote:

". . . It is impossible for the Anglo-Russian entente to be maintained if the estrangement between Britain and Germany ceases . . ."

He was alarmed at the increasing proofs of Germany's efforts to dissipate that estrangement:

". . . If the entent were confined to certain questions, England will see herself forced to consider German wishes relating to concessions and the partition of spheres of influence—this will, step by step, annul our entente and the Anglo-German understanding

*It is part of my system to weaken Prussia; I mean she shall no longer be a power in the political balance of Europe." (Quarante-Cinq Annees de Ma Vie: 1770-1815, by Princess Radziwill.)

will then assume a general character, for such a combination possesses a very fascinating feature for England: the possibility of limiting her armaments."[1]

In a confidential report on Feb. 27, 1914, the Russian Ambassador at Berlin wrote to the Russian Foreign Minister as follows:

"According to wholly confidential reports reaching me the growing military strength of Russia is causing even more serious anxiety at Berlin . . . No wonder that in view of such considerations, the Germans are straining every nerve to be ready for war with us . . . It is my conviction that between the lines printed about Russo-German relations in German newspapers of late one may always read fear of Russia. In conclusion, let me express hope that they are not in error about this at Berlin."*

In his book, NATIONAL DEFENSE, Kirby Page writes on Page 77:

"The Germans were afraid of 'encirclement,' fearful of French revenge and jealousy, alarmed over Pan-Slavism, apprehensive that the British fleet might block the way to the world's resources and a place in the sun.

". . . 'We must make greater exertions than other Powers,' exclaimed Bismarck, 'on account of our geographical position. We lie in the middle of Europe; we can be attacked on all sides. God has put us in a situation in which our neighbors do not allow us to fall into indolence or apathy. The pike in the European fish pond prevent us from becoming carp.'—(BISMARCK, J. W. Headlem, p. 444.)

"'The Germany army,' said Lloyd George in a famous address delivered only a few months before war broke out, "is vital not merely to the existence of the German Empire but to the very life and independence of the nation itself, surrounded as Germany

1. The Secret History of a Great Betrayal, E. D. Morel. Page 23.
*Entente Diplomacy and The World, B. de Siebert, page 711.

is by other nations each of which possesses arms about as powerful as her own . . . She has therefore become alarmed by recent events, and is spending huge sums of money on the expansion of her military resources.'—(Daily Chronicle, Jan. 1, 1914.)

"On an earlier occasion, in Queen's Hall, July 28, 1908, Lloyd George said: 'Look at the position of Germany. Her army is to her what our navy is to us—her sole defense against invasion. . . . Here is Germany in the middle of Europe with France and Russia on either side and with a combination of armies greater than hers . . . Don't forget that when you wonder why Germany is frightened at alliances and understandings.' "

Kirby Page writes further on page 79:

" 'This Teuton block in the middle of Europe,' said the British Major-General Malcolm, 'thrust in between Latin and Slav, presents a horrible problem . . . the position of the Teuton has been that he must always be ready to fight for his life. He must either make himself secure or be obliterated. The result has been to produce a vigorous, aggresive and sometimes unscrupulous race.' — (INFORMATION ON THE REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS, p. 11; J. W. Wheeler-Bennett.)

'The use of uncivilized troops by France was a source of terror to many Germans. In 1913 Von Wrochem wrote: 'France's colored troops should especially not be underestimated; these black beasts fight like wild things and if once they overflowed our land there would be terrible days.'—(THE NEUROSIS OF THE NATIONS, p. 138, C. E. Playne.)"

The Germans experienced the terrors of black occupation troops after the last war. Now rendered defenseless, they are again experiencing a far worse ordeal at the hands of their democratic liberators. Senator James O. Eastland said in the Senate, June 29, 1945 (Congressional

Record, Vol. 91, No. 130, p. 7104.):

"I was informed by generals and high ranking Government officials . . . that in the city of Stuttgart, when the French army moved in, several thousand Christian German girls from good families were rounded up and placed in the subway, and for four or five days they were kept there and criminally assaulted by Senegalese soldiers from Africa. It was one of the most horrible occurences of modern times."

Early in 1914 Britain's secret relations with the Entente were still a matter of uncertainty to the other two members, Russia and France. The Russian Ambassador in Berlin, reporting to Sazonov, February 13, 1914, remarks that Cambon (French Ambassador in Berlin) is very much worried by the constant rumor of an improvement in Anglo-German relations, since he agrees that there is a possibility of rapprochement between these two countries in the future. On the occasion of Tirpitz (head of German Admiralty) making a speech in the Reichstag virtually recognizing British naval superiority, Sazonov wired to Beckendorff (Russian Ambassador in London) about this alarming symptom and his uneasiness at the effort of German diplomacy to bring about a rapprochement with England. He wanted to know in what degree machinations of that sort might find a favorable soil in London. —de Siebert Collection No. 770, as outlined by E. D. Morel in SECRET HISTORY OF A GREAT BETRAYAL, page 34.)

There were groups in England strongly opposed to a rapprochement with Germany. As early as 1897 the Saturday Review on September 11 wrote an explosive article which included these sentences:

"If Germany were extinguished tomorrow, the day after tomorrow there is not an Englishman in the world who would not be the richer . . . *Germania delenda est.*"

Edwin D. Schoonmaker in DEMOCRACY AND WORLD DOMINION, writes on page 69 in regard to this pre-ward period:

"Interesting as all this is in its bearing upon the dire calamity which was soon to engulf the world, the following bit of conversation between a distinguished diplomat, Mr. Henry White, and Mr. Balfour, affords a peculiar insight into the recesses of British foreign policy during this critical period. No one whose reading has covered this interesting period will fail to note that the expressions of this British statesman are typical of similar remarks which crop out of British political literature during this whole period. To get the full force of this remarkable conversation, it should be remembered that it took place upon the eve of the second Hague Conference for the limitation of armament and that Mr. White, then in Brussels, had been asked by President Theodore Roosevelt to go to London to see Mr. Balfour and secure his cooperation in making the coming conference a success. If the reader is amazed by the glimpse into the governing mind of Great Britain, he will note that Mr. White was no less amazed.

"Balfour (somewhat lightly): 'We are probably fools not to find a reason for declaring war on Germany before she builds too many ships and takes away our trade.'

"White: 'You are a very high minded man in private life. How can you possibly contemplate anything so politically immoral as provoking a war against a harmless nation which has as good a right to a navy as you have? If you wish to compete with German trade, work harder.'

"Balfour: 'That would mean lowering our standard of living. Perhaps it would be simpler for us to have a war.'

"White: 'I am shocked that you of all men should

ennunciate such principles.'

"Balfour (again lightly): 'Is it a question of right or wrong? Maybe it is just a question of keeping our supremacy.' "—From HENRY WHITE, THIRTY YEARS OF AMERICAN DIPLOMACY, by Allan Nevins, pp. 257-8.)

Of the years of diplomatic intrigue which led up to 1914, E. D. Morel, former Member of Parliament wrote:

" 'British policy' was the policy not of Britain, but of the handful of liberal cabinet ministers who, with their accomplices in the world of foreign office and embassy officialdom, journalism and finance, were running the country onto the rocks."—(Secret History of a Great Betrayal.)

T. St. John Gaffney, American Consul General at Munich at the outbreak of war in 1914, writes:

"For twenty years previous to the war I had been an annual visitor to England, where I had also a large acquaintance with all classes of the people. I was both astonished and amused at the growth of hostility to Germany, and my English friends did not hesitate to declare to me with perfect frankness and customary English bumptuousness that it was necessary to destroy Germany or England would lose her commercial predominance in the world's market. The question with them was purely one of trade supremacy and with English arrogance they spoke as if they required no allies to accomplish their purpose. I used to laugh at their fears and their boasts and assured them that no spirit of hostility outside trade rivalry prevailed in Germany, but my views were not taken seriously and they one and all declared that in the interest of British trade Germany must be destroyed. Little did I dream at that time of the conspiracy that England had woven to mobilize the world against the Germanic people and how she would succeed in using the blood and treasure of other nations to accom-

plish her criminal ambition."—BREAKING THE SILENCE (p. 11).

Russian Foreign Minister Sazanov need have had no fears of a rapprochement between England and Germany early in 1914.

It was not to be.

CHAPTER THREE

Roping In America—1917

"After the war broke out, the American press, under the tutelage of the English, and its financial and political employers attained the nadir of degradation and in succumbing utterly to the wild excesses of the war-mania, became openly criminal."—(T. St. John Gaffney, in BREAKING THE SILENCE, p. 5.)

British propaganda, never absent among influential, public-opinion forming Americans in times of peace, goes to war for the Empire in 1914. Kirby Page writes of this in NATIONAL DEFENSE (page 126):

"A year after success had crowned the Allied efforts to induce the United States to enter the war, Sir Gilbert Parker in a notable article in Harper's Magazine, March 1918, shed light on the British technique: 'Practically since the day war broke out between England and the Central Powers I became responsible for American publicity. I need hardly say that the scope of my department was very extensive and its activity widely ranged . . . I also frequently arranged for important public men in England to act for us by interviews in American newspapers; and among these distinguished people were Mr. Lloyd George, Viscount Grey, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Sir Edward Carson, Lord Robert Cecil Mr. Walter Runciman, the Lord Chancellor, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Lord Cromer, Will Cooks, Lord Curzon, Lord Gladstone, Lord Haldane, Mr. Henry James, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Selfridge, Mr. Zangwill, Mrs. Humphrey Ward and fully a hundred others.

"Among other things, we supplied three hundred and sixty newspapers in the smaller States of the United States with an English newspaper, which gave

a weekly review and comment of the affairs of the war. We established connection with the man in the street through cinema pictures of the Army and Navy, as well as through interviews, articles, pamphlets, etc. . . . We advised and stimulated many people to write articles; we utilized the services and the assistance of confidential friends . . . Besides an immense private correspondence with individuals, we had our documents and literature sent to great numbers of private libraries, Y. M. C. A. societies, universities, colleges, historical societies and newspapers.' "

The Central Powers had not been so easy to vanquish as the Entente had supposed. The barrage of English propaganda had, as yet, not brought the United States into the war. Again quoting Kirby Page in NATIONAL DEFENSE (p. 135):

"If the Allies had been sure that they could not count upon the eventual support of America, they would in all probability have been compelled to enter into peace negotiations by the end of 1916 or early 1917."

This supports Churchill's statement in August, 1936, to William Griffin, editor and publisher of the New York Enquirer, that:

"America should have minded her own business and stayed out of the World War. If you hadn't entered the war the Allies would have made peace with Germany in the Spring of 1917. Had we made peace then there would have been no collapse in Russia followed by Communism, no breakdown in Italy followed by Fascism, and Germany would not have signed the Versailles Treaty, which has enthroned Nazism in Germany. If America had stayed out of the war, all of these 'isms' wouldn't today be sweeping the continent of Europe and breaking down parliamentary government, and if England had made peace early in 1917, it would have saved over one million British, French, American and other lives."

Returning again to Kirby Page in National Defense:

"John Maynard Keynes says that the inner group at the British Treasury anxiously realized 'how entirely helpless the task would soon have become without the assistance of the United States Treasury.'

"Bonar Law, Chancellor of the British Exchequer, said on July 24, 1917, 'It is an open secret that we had spent so freely of our resources that those available in America had become nearly exhausted when our great Ally entered the struggle.' "

Garet Garret, more recently author of an excellent but not very widely known commentary on the twentieth century American revolution, THE REVOLUTION WAS, wrote in THE BUBBLE THAT BROKE THE WORLD (p. 126):

"In the Spring of 1917 the star of Germanity was overcoming. 'It cannot be said,' wrote General Pershing in his final report, 'that German hopes of a final victory were extravagant, either as viewed at that time or as viewed in the light of history. Financial problems of the Allies were difficult, supplies were becoming exhausted and their armies had suffered tremendous losses. Discouragement existed not only among the civil population but throughout the armies as well.' "

However "hitherto unsuspectedly powerful forces" already had been secretly set in operation.

It is timely to state here, that when any group organizes to make its influence felt in either domestic affairs, international affairs, or both, the results of its policies, and of its actions, are subject to historical analysis and criticism . The growth of the Jewish influence in America is beyond the scope of this inquiry. We are concerned, however, with the influence of ORGANIZED WORLD JEWRY on the participation of the United States in the great wars of this century.

Woodrow Wilson was President during the participation of the United States in the First War Between The Nations. Influences bringing about his election are worthy of examination.

Jennings C. Wise in his book, WOODROW WILSON, DISCIPLE OF REVOLUTION, writes:

> "Marburg noted the headway Wilson was making and felt that he was well on his way to capture him for the Internationalists. Apparently he agreed with his friend, Rabbbi Stephen S. Wise, that if there was to be a Democratic President, Wilson would be preferable to Bryan. Nor was the wise Rabbi the only member of his race who believed this. The upshot was that, thoroughly alive to the value of the Jewish vote, Wilson agreed to speak in Carnegie Hall on the subject of the Russian treaty and the passport question. This speech was one of the most idealistic he ever made. The Jews were greatly pleased. Within a few days Henry Morgenthau and Abram L. Elkus, both prominent representatives of their race, tendered to McCombs their support of Wilson, with whom it was arranged that Morgenthau should serve as Chairman of Wilson's campaign committee.[1] It was directly understood among the three that McCombs would urge Morgenthau's appointment as Secretary of the Treasury and the appointment of Elkus to an important ambassadorial post. (Later, after he had availed himself of Morgenthau's services, Wilson repudiated this agreement; Morgenthau and Elkus were compelled to divide a four-year ambassadorship to Turkey.)
>
> "Bernard Baruch also now came out strongly for Wilson. With no experience in 'big business,' thus insidiously, gradually, surely, Wilson was being obligated to Jewish financiers, while being committed unknown to McCombs, to the program of the Internationalists." (Pages 93-94.)

1. This might be termed the First Morgenthau Plan.

Such were the "hitherto unsuspectedly powerful forces" which were set in operation in 1916. Let us quote directly from the source, a pamphlet published by Samuel Landman, Secretary to the Joint Zionist Council of the United Kingdom in 1912, Joint Editor of the Zionist in 1913-14 and author of pamphlets on History of Zionism and Sionism, Its Organization and Institutions.

In Mr. Landman's pamphlet, GREAT BRITAIN, THE JEWS AND PALESTINE, published in 1936 by the New Zionist Publications, the following appears on pages 4 and 5:*

> "During the critical days of 1916 and of the impending defection of Russia, Jewry, as a whole, was against the Czarist regime and had hopes that Germany, if victorious, would in certain circumstances give them Palestine. Several attempts to bring America into the war on the side of the Allies by influencing Jewish opinion had failed. Mr. James A. Malcolm, who was already aware of German prewar efforts to secure a foothold in Palestine through the Zionist Jews and of the abortive Anglo-French demarches at Washington and New York; and knew that Woodrow Wilson, for good and sufficient reasons, always attached the greatest importance to the advice of a very prominent Zionist (Mr. Justice Brandies of the U. S. Supreme Court); and was in close touch with Mr. Greenberg, Editor of the Jewish Chronicle (London); and knew that several important Zionist leaders had already gravitated to London from the Continent on the *qui vive* awaiting events; and appreciated and realized the depth and strength of Jewish National aspirations; spontaneously took the initiative, to convince first of all Sir Mark Sykes, Under Secretary of the War Cabinet, and afterwards Monsier Picot, of the French Embassy in London, and Monsieur Gour of the Quai d'Orsay (Eastern Section), that the best and per-

*Also see Jewish Chronicle, December 20, 1935, February 7, and May 8, 1936; and World Jewry, February 22 and March 1, 1935.

haps the only way (which proved so to be) to induce the American President to come into the War was to secure the co-operation of Zionist Jews by promising them Palentine, and thus enlist and mobilize the *hitherto unsuspectedly powerful forces* (italics ours—Ed.) of the Zionist Jews in America and elsewhere in favor of the Allies on a *quid pro quo* contract basis. Thus, as will be seen, the Zionists, having carried out their part, and greatly helped to bring America in, the Balfour Declaration of 1917 was but the public confirmation of the necessarily secret gentlemen's agreement of 1916 made with the previous knowledge, acquiesence and/or approval of the Arabs and of the British, American, French and other Allied Governments, and not merely a voluntary altruistic and romantic gesture on the part of Great Britain as certain people either through pardonable ignorance or unpardonable ill-will would represent or rather misrepresent . . . .

"An interesting account of the negotiations carried on in London and Paris and subsequent developments, has already appeared in the Jewish press and need not be repeated here in detail, except to recall that immediately after the 'gentlemen's' agreement between Sir Mark Sykes authorized by the War Cabinet and the Zionist leaders, cable facilities through the War Office, the Foreign Office and the British Embassies, Legations, etc., were given to the latter to communicate the glad tidings to their friends and organizations in America and elsewhere, and the change in official and public opinion as reflected in the American press in favour of joining the Allies in the War, was gratifying as it was surprisingly rapid."

Apparently this agreement was timed to swing influential support over to Wilson in the election of 1916. Jennings C. Wise writes in his book:

"Another new source of support in 1916 was the sudden and tremendous enthusiasm displayed by Zion-

is Jewry for Woodrow Wilson. About this there is perhaps a little mystery. Referring to a pamphlet published in 1936 by Samuel Landman, Solicitor and Secretary of the Zionist organization during the War, which purports to make quite clear the switch in Jewish support from the German to the Allied cause: the initial bias was not simply anti-Russian but pro-German. The reason was that the Zionists had expected to 'close a deal' with Germany, for the later possession of Palestine, which they subsequently effected with the Allies.

"Jewish influence had much to do with Wilson's initial anti-Entente bias. Later, it influenced him in the opposite direction. The Jewish backing he enjoyed in 1916 constitutes strong circumstantial evidence that Wilson had subscribed, at least tentatively, to the British deal with the Zionists. . . ." (page 458.)

To return to the Landman pamphlet, this writer says further:

". . . the fact that it was Jewish help that brought the U. S. A. into the War on the side of the Allies, has rankled ever since in German—especially Nazi—minds and has contributed in no small measure to the prominence which anti-semitism occupies in the Nazi program."

Jennings Wise adds in a footnote on page 524:

". . . the Zionist-Ally deal which may have influenced Wilson against the Germans initially, the actual, much later entrance into the war of the United States was directly provoked by specific German acts, having no relation to the Zionist incident."

It is a matter of historical record that the State Department held Germany to strict accountability on agreed rules of the sea while at the same time overlooking the British violations which the Germans were combatting. Apparently everything was done to force a breach that would publicly justify a declaration of war. A more extensive study could draw a parallel with the diplomatic chicanery, for it was nothing less than that,

during the 1939-41 period. One cannot escape observing the outline of a plan to involve the United States in the policy of world imperialism in which it is still enmeshed.*

The entrance of the United States into the First War Between the Nations was decisive.

We will now examine a number of observations and comments on the making of the peace.

"My views," writes Robert Lansing, Secretary of State throughout the War, and one of the five American representatives at the Peace Conference, in his book, THE PEACE NEGOTIATIONS, "concerning the Treaty at the time of the conversations with Mr. Bullitt are expressed in a memorandum of May 8, 1919, which is as follows:

"The terms of peace were yesterday delivered to the German plentipotentaries, and for the first time in these days of feverish rush of preparation there is time to consider the treaty as a complete document.

"The impression made by it is one of disappointment, of regret, and of depression. The terms of peace appear immeasurably harsh and humiliating, while many of them seem to me impossible of performance.

"The League of Nations created by the Treaty is relied upon to preserve the artificial structure which has been erected by compromise of conflicting interests of the Great Powers and to prevent the germination of the seeds of war which are sown in so many articles and which under normal conditions would soon bear fruit. The League might as well attempt to prevent the growth of plant life in a tropical jungle. War will come sooner or later.

"It must be admitted in honesty that the League is an instrument of the mighty to check the normal growth of national power and national aspirations

*Charles A. Beard, American Foreign Policy In the Making, 1932-1940. Also see "America Goes to War," by Charles C. Tansill.

among those who have been rendered impotent by defeat. Examine the treaty and you will find peoples delivered against their will into the hands of those whom they hate, while their economic resources are torn from them and given to others. Resentment and bitterness, if not desperation are bound to be the consequences of such provisions. It may be years before these oppressed peoples are able to throw off the yoke, but as the day follows night the time will come when they will make the effort.

"This war was fought by the United States to destroy forever the conditions which produced it. These conditions have not been destroyed. They have been supplanted by other conditions equally productive of hatred, jealousy and suspicion. In place of the Triple Alliance and the Entente has arisen the Quintuple Alliance which is to rule the world. The victors in this war intend to impose their combined will upon the vanquished and to subordinate all interests to their own.

"It is true that to please the aroused opinion of mankind and to respond to the idealism of the moralist they have surrounded the new alliance with a halo and called it 'The League of Nations' but whatever it may be called or however it may be disguised it is an alliance of the Five Great Military Powers.

"It is useless to close our eyes to the fact that the power to compel obedience by the exercise of the united strength of 'The Five' is a fundamental principle of the League. Justice is secondary. Might is primary.

"The League as now constituted will be the prey of greed and intrigue; and the law of unanimity in the council, which may offer restraint will be broken or render the organization powerless. It is called upon to stamp as just what is unjust."

"We have a treaty of peace, but it will not bring permanent peace because it is founded on the shifting sands of self interest."

"In the view thus expressed I was not alone. A

few days after they were written I was in London, where I discussed the treaty with several leading British statesmen. I noted their opinions thus: 'the concensus was that the treaty was unwise and unworkable, that it was conceived in intrigue and fashioned in cupidity, and that it would produce rather than prevent wars.' One of these leaders of political thought in Great Britain said that 'the only apparent purpose of the League of Nations seems to be to perpetuate the series of unjust provisions which are being imposed.'" (Page 272.)

J. Middleton Murry, an English author of note, writes in a similar vein in THE BETRAYAL OF CHRIST BY THE CHURCHES (page 143):

"Theoretically, the proper form of a democratic peace was adumbrated in the formation of the League of Nations; but this was completely perverted by founding the League on the sacrosanctity of the punitive and vindicitive Peace Treaty. This corruption of the new idea by using the League, of which the most active elements were successor-states created at the expense of the two German Empires, to act as a jailer to a prostrate Germany, was the major political crime of the modern age. For the League of Nations was a necessary idea, if the world was to be made safe for democracy. Either it or some similar form of closer international organization was the rightful consequence of the victory of the democracies. By perverting it into an instrument of domination, they prevented Europe from finding any way forward, and condemned Europe to a final frenzy of nationalist and totalitarian war, in the course of which it is probable that democracy will perish."

Dr. Edward J. Dillon concluded the Foreword of his book, THE INSIDE STORY OF THE PEACE CONFERENCE, with these words:

"In the meanwhile the Conference . . . has transformed Europe into a seething mass of mutually hostile states powerless to face the economic competition of

their overseas rivals and has set the very elements of society in flux."

That was in the year 1919.

Dr. Dillon makes other observations of interest:

"Of all the collectivities whose interests were furthered at the Conference, the Jews had perhaps the most resourceful and certainly the most influential exponents. There were Jews from Palestine, from Poland, Russia, the Ukraine, Rumania, Greece, Britain, Holland and Belgium; but the largest and most brilliant contingent was sent by the United States . . . Western Jews, who championed their Eastern brothers, proceeded to demand a further concession (aside from removing existing disabilities) which many of their co-religionists hastened to disclaim as dangerous—a kind of autonomy which Rumanian, Polish and Russian statesman, as well as many of their Jewish fellow subjects, regarded as tantamount to the creation of a state within a state. Whether this estimate is true or erroneous, the concessions asked for were given, but supplementary treaties insuring the protection of minorities are believed to have little chance of being executed, and may, it is feared, provoke manifestations of elemental passions in the countries in which they are to be applied." (Page 12.)

Dr. Dillon says the delegates:

". . . feared that a religious—some would call it racial—bias lay at the root of Mr. Wilson's policy. It may seem amazing to some readers, but it is none the less a fact that a considerable number of delegates believed the real influences behind the Anglo-Saxon people were Semitic.

"They confronted the President's proposal on the subject of religious inequality, and in particular, the odd motive alleged for it, with the measures for the protection of minorities which he subquently imposed on the lesser states, and which had for their keynote to satisfy the Jewish elements in Eastern Europe. And they concluded that the consequence of expedients

framed and enforced in this direction were inspired by Jews, assembled in Paris for the purpose of realizing their carefully thought-out program, which they succeeded in having substantially executed. However right or wrong these delegates may have been it would be a dangerous mistake to ignore their views, seeing that they have since become one of the permanent elements of the situation. The formula into which this policy was thrown by the members of the conference, whose countries it affected, and who regard it as fatal to the peace of Eastern Europe was this: 'Henceforth the world will be governed by the Anglo-Saxon peoples, who, in turn are swayed by their Jewish elements.'" (Page 497.)

This review of the influences that brought the United States into the First World War began with the United States and the British Empire reaching for world power by a coalescing of interests. It ends with the policies of the two English-speaking countries being influenced by an intensely self-interested race.

On such a scene as this, born of the spirit of liberalism, the Jew, freed from old restrictions imposed by nations who held their national heritage above commercial enterprise, expanded his energies and talents to influence every phase of activity of what can be called the commercially intense nations. Werner Sombart, the German social philosopher and historian, has written:

"The Jewish spirit, after all, largely controls our entire age, for what has been characterized as the spirit of this economic age, is, in fact largely a Jewish spirit. And Karl Marx was certainly right to the extent in which he said that 'the practical Jewish spirit became the practical spirit of the Christian peoples,' that 'the Jews have emancipated themselves to the extent in which Christians have become Jews' and that 'the real nature of the Jew has realized itself in the bourgeois society.'" (A NEW SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, p. 178.)*

*See Marxism and Judaism, by Salluste La Revue de Paris, Juillet—Aout, 1928.

CHAPTER FOUR

Twenty Years Armistice

"Behind the facade of Government two occult powers are now determining the destinies of the world.

"One of these is the disseminated Wealth of the Democracy, canalized both by the plutocratic oligarchy of the Bankers (la Haute Finance), whose clients, the Modern States, great and small, are constrained to apply to them for immense loans, and by the great manufacturers and mining proprietors, who tend to be actuated solely by economic interest and who often combine in international trusts, the operations of which are merely hampered by patriotic questions of national policy and national honour.

"The other power is the mysterious pervasive force known a Public Opinion, which is becoming more and more conscious of its efficacy, and, as its curiosity concerning the public weal and concerning international facts and correlations grows more alert, is manifesting a proportionately livelier jealousy of its prerogatives."—(William Morton Fullerton, Problems of Power (page 1.)

The twenty years armistice between the two World Wars has been well called by one writer, John Howland Snow, the "tragic interludes of 'Peace.'"* Of this period William Orton wrote in the preface to his book, TWENTY YEARS' ARMISTICE—1918-1938:

"Twenty years ago the great guns of the west ceased firing. Millions of exhausted men sought home and work, leaving their dead behind them. But up in the Arctic Circle, across the Polish marshes and the Russian plains, along the Danube and the Mediterranean, in Asia Minor and Serbia, the war went on. Suicide, assassination, and revolution swept through the

*America . . . WHICH WAY? page 23.

western world. Bounteous harvests brought ruin and not rejoicing, debt piled on debt, hatred across frontiers reflected the deepening privation within.

"The first decade brought general economic disaster. In the second the political structure began to crack, as a settlement backed by force felt the strain of an answering counter thrust. No more than a collapsing house can suddenly be rebuilt could Europe swiftly be reconstructed; instead came an inconceivable rearmament. Such effort as had never been mobilized for living was again mobilized for destruction. While babies were masked against poison from the sky, old men dug holes in the ground for refuge, and millions of youths trod their fathers' tracks the road to death.

"Will it never end? May our children live? Is there anywhere, in this shame of civilization, the germ of a new conscience, the hope of a true peace? It is time to take stock. Versailles, Geneva, Locarno—where and how did we fail? Or is there a curse on us all: on all our pacts, treaties, and covenants? It is of no more use to group ourselves into rival gangs to defame and denounce each other, with the good men all on one side—one's own—and the bad men all on the other. That way lies everlasting war. It is of no more use to hope that men will become brothers overnight, with a sudden dawn of reason triumphant over centuries of passion. But hope itself we cannot abandon: because we dare not.

"It is time to take stock; to survey these two ghastly decades from the depth of our economic and political distress, and face our errors. War is now, as it never was before, the major industry—in dollars and cents—of nearly all 'civilized' peoples. Even America renounces war on paper and arms to the teeth in practice; every frontier of the old world, every capital, prepares for the coming death. Something is wrong—not merely with day to day policy, but the fundamental attitudes and assumptions which that policy reflects. Perhaps a review of the record will help to reveal what is wrong. The construction of a social order based on

peace instead of war cannot be accomplished by **a priori** schemes of any sort whatever; it must proceed from realistic study of what has actually happened, why and how."*

Such is this attempt.

We have reviewed a number of responsible opinions on the Versailles Treaty. Admittedly the Entent attempt at peace was a failure. We have also reviewed some influences making that "peace." Germany, precariously shaky within, accepted an armistice on the basis of Wilson's Fourteen Points, while her still well-equipped armies were in the field. Forced to bear the onus of the "Guilty Nation" as a sop to public opinion in the countries of the conquerors, Germany was made to suffer to an appalling extent from the British blockade for months after the armistice was signed. (For a complete description read Arthur Bryant's UNFINISHED VICTORY, the chapter Famine Over Europe.)

Professor Harry Elmer Barnes, author of THE GENESIS OF THE WORLD WAR; IN QUEST OF TRUTH AND JUSTICE, etc., wrote in part in The New York World Telegram on March 29, 1940:

"Some maintain that one people is more cruel and brutal than another. They point to the long-since-exploded German atrocities during the World War and to Hitler's treatment of the Jews. But they overlook that fact far and away the greatest atrocity in all human history was the British blockade of Germany for months after November, 1918, as a result of which over 800,000 German women, children and old people were starved to death and millions were emaciated and stunted.

"Had Hitler tortured and killed every one of a half million Jews living in Germany in 1933 such a foul and detestable act *would still have left him a piker compared with Britain's blockade of* 1918-19." (Italics ours —Ed.)

*See Appendix IV.

Collin Brooks, English author of books on economics and finance, writes in CAN CHAMBERLAIN SAVE GREAT BRITAIN?:

"Germany herself never accepted, and does not now accept, the view that she was blood guilty, nor the view that she was thoroughly defeated in the field. Nine days before the Armistice one of the German High Command told his Government that 'the German army is still strong enough to stand against its opponents for months to come, to achieve local success and exact new sacrifices from the enemy.'

"We are not here concerned to argue the rightness of either viewpoint. We are concerned only to note the indisputable fact that, whatever the guilt of Germany in 1914 and whatever the state of her armies in 1918, she accepted an armistice on terms that were afterwards deliberately broken.

"The 'Treaty' was handed to her, metaphorically, on the point of a bayonet. It was, therefore, not a treaty at all, since the very word means an agreement reached by negotiation. The German Empire was stripped of its overseas possessions. These were the two most glaring breaches of faith which rankled in the bosoms of the German people long after the War had ended. That Germany should be disarmed while her small and vindictive neighbors were strongly arming rankled only less bitterly.

"What followed?

"The events in post-war Germany have been often described. To avoid any suspicion of over-statement arising from personal prejudice I extract a striking account from a book written from the standpoint of observers who would place their faith in the old democracy rather than in new dictatorship,' which was published in 1935. It is THE WAY OF THE DICTATORS, by Lewis Broad and Leonard Russell.

"With admirable restraint they write:

" 'The economic distress in Germany in the decade following the War was more severe than anything known in England in modern times. It fell short, certainly, of the famine in Russia, but the German people endured privations unparalleled among civilized races in our day. As a result of the Allied blockade—which continued for some months after the War ended—there was a scarcity of all kinds of food. The nation lost much of its power of resistance to illness and infection; ill-nourishment produced a mental inertia in adults; children were to be seen suffering from hunger madness.

" 'These were the conditions that saw the birth of Hitlerism.

" 'The blockade was lifted; the standard of living gradually improved, but it remained, and remains below the level in England and France. The working classes had a grim struggle for existence. There was the nightmare for the nation of the catastrophic plunges of the Mark, when as paper money was churned out by the printing presses the people's wealth and savings vanished. There was a respite, and then Germany felt the onset of the world economic blizzard. The chaos of national bankruptcy again appeared imminent. Trade and industry collapsed, men went out of work thousand after thousand, until at one time it was estimated that the unemployed touched a figure of ten millions.

" 'This is the background, these are the conditions, which explain the rise of Hitlerism. The older democratic parties appeared to be failing in the maintenance of the old order. The people turned to Hitler as the strong man who could save the country from bolshevism. The older parties were conscious of the limitations of their ability and power. Hitler was conscious of the national aspirations, and proclaimed his ability to bring about their fulfilment.' " (Page 120.)

Lloyd George, in THE TRUTH ABOUT THE PEACE TREATIES, writes:

"It is not difficult to patch up a peace that may last until the generation which experienced the horrors of war has passed away . . . What is difficult is to draw up a peace which will not provoke a fresh struggle when those who have had practical experience of what war means have passed away . . . you may strip Germany of her colonies, reduce her armaments to a mere police force and her navy to that of a fifth-rate power; all the same, in the end if she feels that she has been unjustly treated in the peace of 1919 she will find means of exacting retribution from her conquerors . . . Injustice, arrogance, displayed in the hour of triumph will never be forgotten or forgiven.

"For these reasons I am, therefore, strongly averse to transferring more Germans from German rule to the rule of some other nation than can possibly be helped. I cannot conceive any greater cause of future war than that the German people who have certainly proved themselves one of the most vigorous and powerful races in the world, should be surrounded by a number of small states, many of them consisting of people who have never previously set up a stable government for themselves, but each of them containing large masses of Germans clamoring for reunion with their native land. The proposal of the Polish Commission that we should place 2,100,000 Germans under the control of a people which is of a different religion and which has never proved its capacity for stable self-government throughout its history must in my judgment lead sooner or later to a new war in the East of Europe.

"If we are wise, we shall offer to Germany a peace, which while just, will be preferable for all sensible men to the alternative of Boshevism . . . We cannot both cripple her and expect her to pay . . . It must be a settlement which will contain in itself no provocations for future wars . . ."

Clemenceau, supported by a telegram sent to Lloyd George by 370 of his supporters in Parliament urging him to redeem his election pledges to "hang the Kaiser" and to make Germany pay till the "pips squeaked," was able to bring to naught this belated sanity on the part of a man elected to make a peace.

Kirby Page quotes other English opinion as follows:*

"The memoirs of Lord Carnock which have recently been published contain much significant data. As Sir Arthur Nicolson, he was Permanent Under-Secretary of Foreign Affairs during the critical days prior to and after the outbreak of hostilities. In the present volume which has been edited by his son we are informed that Lord Carnock 'was incensed by the theory, which was even then (1917) being propagated, that Germany had provoked the war . . . He followed the peace negotiations with interest and apprehension. He was appalled by the Treaty of Versailles. Particularly did he resent the paragraph which obliged Germany by force to admit that she was solely responsible for the war.' (PORTRAIT OF A DIPLOMATIST. Page 314.)

"After endeavoring to interpret the reasons why his father's generation of diplomats felt obliged to follow policies which eventually proved to be fatal, Mr. Harold Nicolson, himself a qualified student of international affairs, wrote in PORTRAIT OF A DIPLOMATIST, XV, XVI.)

" 'This does not mean that I consider Germany responsible for the war, or that I feel anything but dislike for that ignorant and disgraceful paragraph in the Treaty of Versailles which endeavors to fix such responsibility upon her. I consider on the contrary that Germany is placed at an unfair disadvantage in all discussions of the origins, as distinct from the causes of the war. As regards the origins (1900-14) I consider Germany at fault; though even less at fault than Austria or Russia. As regards the causes (1500-1900) I con-

*National Defense, page 111.

sider the main onus falls on England. This distinction requires further explanation. By 1900, having absorbed the Dutch Republics in South Africa, the British Empire was satiated. She desired only to preserve the vast possessions which she had acquired. This placed her in a defensive position—a position which it is easy to represent as being honorable and pacific. Our own predatory period—and it was disgraceful enough—dated from 1600 to 1900. During that period we were far more violent and untruthful than were the Germans during those fourteen years which preceded the war. Unfortunately, however, the historians of the war are bound from lack of space to throw the maximum emphasis upon the period when England was sitting digestive in her armchair and when Germany, young and hungry, was manifesting the unwisdom of adolescence. Before we blame Germany, we must first blame our own Elizabethans The spirit was exactly the same. The Germans, however, owing to a higher state of culture and rectitude, behaved less blatantly; and were less successful.' "

Evidently the Germans have never been quite tough enough in their war policies to entitle them to a seat among the mighty who put their official seal on all righteousness. In London on January 9, 1946, Air Marshal Sir Arthur Tedder told high British officers that Germany had lost the war because she had not followed the principles of total warfare.*—(N. Y. Times, Jan. 10, 1946.)

Freda Utley, an Englishwoman, married to a Russian Jew, disillusioned after living for some years in the Soviet Union, writes:

"It is usual to say that the Nazis will never be satisfied, and to picture the Germans as a peculiar people, more aggressive and power-loving and chauvinist than the British and French and other 'peace-loving powers.' This argument takes no account of past history of the fundamental causes of German aggression. In the past

*See Appendices V and VI.

Britain and France were just as aggressive, else they could never have acquired their great colonial empires. The scramble for colonies went on merrily all through the nineteenth century and came to an end only when most of Asia and Africa had been divided up. By the opening years of the twentieth century England and France had not only bitten off about as much as they could chew, but realized that further colonial conquest must lead to war between the imperialist powers. Hence the Open Door policy proclaimed for China by the United States at Britain's instigation. Moreover, the ease and security which colonial exploitation had produced in England and France conduced to a pacific temper and a desire to sit down and enjoy life. Why should we assume that the Germans would react any differently to the possession of a great empire? The argument that they are peculiarly aggressive by nature simply does not hold water. Until the Napoleonic wars the Germans had little national consciousness and were regarded as hopelessly peaceful people by the more 'virile' French. French aggression from Louis XIV to Napoleon finally galvanized the Germans into abandoning their old pleasant unnationalist and pacific ways. They formed themselves into a nation under Prussian leadership, but by that time most of the 'uncivilized' races and peoples had already been conquered by Britain, France, Holland, Belgium and the United States. Since there were no more colored people to conquer, the Germans were driven, first in 1914-18, to attempt a redivision of Asia and Africa through the defeat of France and England, and then from 1933 onward to try to form a European empire." (THE DREAM WE LOST, page 339.)

Arthur Bryant writes of the Treaty (in UNFINISHED VICTORY):

"The evil went far beyond the confines of Germany. Before the war she had been the best customer of Austria-Hungary, Italy, Russia, Holland, Norway, Switzerland and all Scandinavia, and the second best

of Great Britain, France and Belgium. German capital and organization had helped to turn the wheels of industry in every country in central and eastern Europe. The economic dislocation of Germany meant, therefore, the economic dislocation of a whole continent . . . So blinded were men by hatred after the suffering and destruction of four year's warfare that many otherwise sane leaders of industry and finance lent themselves to this suicidal policy. They thought that by doing so they would cripple an energetic and dangerous rival forever." (Page 69.)

". . . the misery of Austria provided one of the most terrible spectacles of post-war Europe." (Page 96.)

We could quote many more authorities on what the Peace of 1919 meant to Europe in starvation, misery and horror.

Two English writers tell us *who* used to advantage this misery and prostration of Teutonic peoples in Central Europe.

Ellis Ashmead Bartlett writes:

"Among this conglomeration of nationalities and creeds (in Vienna—Ed.) the Jew stood out prominently and dominated every situation. Jews of every race were to be found amongst this cosmopolitan throng and as the Jew knows no frontiers except the faith of his co-religionists. He was generally first in possession of news, true or false, and was thus able to control the great speculative market . . . One only sees the Jew in his real element during these world cataclysms. It is only then that his peculiar qualities have full scope for their employment.

"Thus, dying Austria became the happy hunting ground for the Jewish vulture although foreign 'Has-Vogels' were also plentiful . . . The little Jews swarmed over Vienna and devoured its decaying remains like flies round a raw steak on a hot summer's day. One could scarcely walk in the street without treading on them. The city, its institutions, finance and material

wealth crumbled in their hands and they crowded out the hotels, restaurants, cafes and shops." (THE TRAGEDY OF CENTRAL EUROPE, page 37.)

Arthur Byrant writes of Germany (in UNFINISHED VICTORY):

"The change in the distribution of German wealth that followed this great disaster (the inflation—Ed.) amounted to nothing less than a revolution . . . the chief gainers were those who had been able to command foreign currency . . . It was the Jews with their international affiliations and their hereditary flair for finance who were best able to seize such opportunities. . . . They did so with such effect that even in November, 1938, after five years of anti-semitic legislation and persecution, they still owned according to the The Times (London) correspondent in Berlin, something like a third of the real property in the Reich. Most of it came into their hands during the inflation . . . The Jews obtained a wonderful ascendancy in politics, business and the learned professions . . . In the artistic and learned professions the Jewish supremacy was as marked. Authoriship in Germany almost seemed to have become a kind of Hebrew monoply." (Pages 135-137.)

Vladimir de Korostovetz, one of a prominent pre-War Russian-Ukranian family, writes of postwar Germany:

"Organizers of the White Slave traffic swooped down on pre-Hitler Germany like birds of prey. They formed bogus companies . . . making adventure films . . . in South America . . . signed contracts with armies of film-struck girls who were promptly packed off to South America . . . The whole of this unsavory trade was in the hands of International Jewry in general and the scum of Russian Jewry in particular . . . German theatres and cinemas were in the hands of speculators and controlled by International Jews, whose motto was Money, Money, Money. They made fortunes fostering extremism." (EUROPE IN THE MELTING POT, pages 96-97.)

Sisley Huddleston, well-known English journalist, in his book WAR UNLESS, tells us how Germany reacted to this alien exploitation:

> "There have been three stages of Germany's revolt: first, despair, which provoked passive resistance and bankruptcy; second, finesse, of which Stresemann was the principle exponent by which Germany gradually moved from one position to another; third, force." (Page 79.)

After years of travail, President von Hindenburg appointed Adolf Hitler, leader of the National Socialist party, to the Chancellorship. The new Government's policies were designed to bring order out of chaos. An end was put to wrangling of the numerous political parties. Restrictions, applicable only within the Reich, were imposed upon those who had taken advantage of the internal political and economic disorganization. A period of stability began. Conditions improved.

The National Socialist Party had been in power scarcely six months when Samuel Untermeyer,* prominent Jewish attorney of New York, delivered a significant address. On August 7, 1933, the day of his arrival from Europe, where he had gone to attend a meeting of the International Jewish Congress at The Hague, Mr. Untermeyer said, in part, over Radio Station WABC:

> "I deeply appreciate your enthusiastic greeting on my arrival today, which I quite understand is addressed not to me, personally, but to the *holy war* in the cause of humanity *in which we are embarked* . . . It is a war that must be waged unremittingly until the black clouds of bigotry, race hatred and fanaticism, that have descended upon what was once Germany, but is now medieval Hitler land, have been dispersed. If we once admit, as is brazenly insisted by the German Government, that such fiendish persecution of the people of one race or creed is an internal domestic affair, and not a world concern, how are we to know whose turn will be next? Now or never must all nations of the earth make common cause against the monstrous claim that the slaughter, starvation and annihiliation without rhyme or reason . . . is an internal affair against which the rest of the world must stand idly by and not lift a hand in defense . . . *for the Jews are the aristocrats of the world.*"

*Attorney for Charles M. Schwab during First World War years, Untermeyer made millions in Bethlehem Steel Corporation stock.

Thus, in 1933, Organized World Jewry publicly and openly declared war on Germany.

Here is a super-national group of people capable of frustrating efforts toward international amity whenever it sees fit to regard its racial members as being unfairly dealt with. That its members may be guilty of offenses against the customs, traditions, and national cultures of the nations in whose midst they live is, apparently, of no consequence.

Walter Rathenau,[1] ever torn between his German environment and his racial inheritance, perceived this cleavage between Jews and the people among whom they lived. In Maximilian Harden's paper, Zukunft, March 6th, 1897, he struggles to give a clear picture of the Jewish problem:

> "Whoever wishes to see it, should wander through the Tiergartenstrasse at twelve o'clock on a Berlin Sunday morning, or else look into the foyer of a theatre in the evening. Strange sight! There in the midst of German life is an isolated race of men. Loud and self-conscious in their dress, hot-blooded and restless in their manner . . . An asiatic horde on the sandy plains of Prussia . . . Forming among themselves a close corporation, rigorously shut off from the rest of the world. Thus, they live half-willingly in their invisible ghetto, not a living limb of the people, but an alien organism in its body . . ." (Walter Rathenau, Kessler, page 37.)

Now, with this background, let us proceed to the world situation, which, rather than becoming more serene

1. See Appendix VII.

and secure with the advent of a stable regime in Germany, becomes increasingly agitated.

Douglas Reed, for 11 years, foreign correspondent for The London Times, in his book, DISGRACE ABOUNDING, gives a survey of conditions in Central Europe somewhat different from that of Europe being devoured by an insatiable beast, we Americans have been asked to believe. Referring to the surrender of Czecho-Slovakia to Germany by the democracies, Reed writes:

> "The Austrians were of German stock; many of them wanted Hitler; many evils needed remedying in Austria,[2] which a lethargic vested interest regime, monarchists, clericals and Jews, would never have altered. But here . . . in Prague? . . . business was thriving in Prague. One reason was Prague had become a clearing house for Jewish emigration." (Page 458.)

> "But on this occasion chance has enabled me, in an additional chapter, to give you the best possible example of the way organized world Jewry works and of the immense power it wielded in goading word opinion against Germany." (Page 477.)

Then about his American publisher declining to publish DISGRACE ABOUNDING he writes:

> "The real meaning of that decision is that, you may slander and libel Germany as much as you like, and be paid for it, but you must not discuss the Jewish problem, you must not assert that there is a Jewish problem . . . One publisher, not a Jew, said that an American publisher would court misfortune by publishing it, because 90 per cent of the American newspapers are Jewish and the Jewish influence extends in similar proportion throughout the whole ring of trades connected with publishing . . . The importance of this, for you, is that you should realize that what is presented to you as 'American Approval' or 'American Disapproval' of this or that British policy is not American but Jewish

2. See Appendix VIII.

> opinion . . . If you are to fight Germany again, you must do it for England's sake. You must not allow yourselves to be egged on by Jews masquerading today as 'German public opinion,' tomorrow as "Czechoslovak public opinion,' the day after as 'English public opinion' and the next day as 'American public opinion.' "

Mr. Reed brings to us information about economic and social conditions in Europe not widely publicized in America:

> "One day in the House of Commons, Mr. R. S. Hudson, of your Department of Overseas Trade, said:

> " 'Germany was not discriminating against British goods in Germany. Our complaint was that Germany was by her methods destroying trade throughout the world . . . It is difficult to get exact information of the way things are done, but in Central and Southeastern Europe the basis of Germany's hold is that she pays to the producer much more than the world price. They obviously do that at the expense of their own people, but it does effect us.' "

Then Reed says:

> "Germans, in their country are not less well cared for than English people in theirs, but better." (Page 188.)

Reed then quotes Mr. Hudson again:

> " 'No one wants to introduce similar methods. We do not want to see the cost of bread increased in England because we buy in competition with Germany, wheat in Rumania at over the world price. But clearly we have to meet this competition in the case of Poland, and the Government has made a survey of all possible methods. The only way the Government sees is by organizing our industries in such a way that they will be able to speak as units with their opposite number in Germany and say 'Unless you are prepared to put an end to this form of competition and come to an agreement on the market prices which represent a reasonable

return, then we will fight you and beat you at your own game.' "

To this lesson in economics by Parliamentary Secretary Hudson of His Majesty's Overseas Trade Department, Mr. Reed is quick to reply:

"This is not an answer unless you improve the condition of your work people. It is not enough to say that you will at all cost defend the profits of your manufacturers—unless you are simultaneously prepared to raise the standard of living of your work people."

Reed, quoting Hudson again:

" 'Clearly this country is infinitely stronger than, I was going to say any country, but certainly Germany. Therefore, we have a great advantage, which would result in our winning the fight.' "

Reed, continuing his comment:

" . . . at last, at long last, and after so many years of warnings, the danger seems to have been realized. But you will have to gird your loins as you never did before, if your are really going to win this fight. You are faced with a country immensely strong in arms and immensely strong in real wealth—not gold bars in a vault of the national bank, but industry, agriculture, the thrift and energy of the work people, and the conditions of life they enjoy.

"In Germany now they have a mighty organization, equipped with full powers, for improving the lot of the work people in factories and work shops. Their engineers and social workers and artists go into the factories and see what needs to be done. They say that a shower room, a recreation room, a restaurant, a medical clinic, a dental clinic is needed and these are provided. They have a civic sense, a social conscience, a feeling of the community of German mankind—in spite of their bestial concentration camps—which you lack." (Page 190.)

Reed, placing English supremacy above any question

of right or wrong, as Mr. Balfour had before him, says:

"England is rearming to meet some imminent and deadly danger. What danger? Germany. We are not strong enough to withstand her alone; we can only withstand her if we have allies. Our War Minister has stated that in a European war in which we take part we shall send nineteen divisions to the Continental mainland.

"Presumably to ensure the victory of the Policy of Appeasement by Non-Intervention in the Sacred Right of Self-Extermination.

"The Czecho-Slovak army had forty-two divisions. If we had let Czecho-Slovakia fight for us, we should presumably not have needed to send the flower of a new British generation abroad to die in the most unfavorable circumstances, for what we can send is less than half what Czecho-Slovakia had."

Here we have British diplomacy revealed:

*The constant quest for allies to do battle for British interests whenever and wherever their supremacy is endangered.**

We are indebted to Mr. Reed for giving us a glimpse of the forces gathering for an assault upon the continent —the dark thunderheads of war forming in England with alien, non-British aid.

Freda Utley has a word to say about Mr. Hudson's complaint against Germany:

"When the world economic crisis began in 1920, the fall in value of their agriculture exports drove weaker nations of Europe, which had no closed colonial

*Latest press and radio reports have General Anders' homeless Polish Army being made a part of the British army, the Dutch home guard being taken under the protective guidance of the British command, and the formation of a German army under General Rundstedt to fight for British interests acquired in Germany by conquest. Perhaps this accounts for the sudden effort to establish an official government in the country against which Britain and her allies so lately fought a victorious war of destruction.

markets, near to bankruptcy. Unable to pay their debts, they dropped out of the international monetary system and started to trade by barter. Germany took the lead in organizing and profiting from this new system of trade—trade among debtors who could no longer get credits from the United States, Britain and France because the gold standard has broken down almost everywhere. Managed currencies, quotas, blocked credits, and barter trade led to the establishment of virtual state monopolies of foreign trade in one country after another. This new method of trading enabled fascist Powers to defy the financial power of England, France and the United States, which the Germans termed international Jewish finance.'" (The Dream We Lost, pages 345-346.)

Both Mr. Hudson and Mr. Reed have allowed no question of right or wrong to influence their thinking about the new method of trading which enabled the Fascist powers to escape from the burdensome tolls of international finance. Even war was no deterrent. We quote Kirby Page:

"One of the terrible results of war is found in the fact that it releases such an immeasurable volume of hatred that the victors demand their utmost pound of flesh from the vanquished and thereby sow the seeds of another conflict. The Treaty of Versailles and other World War treaties placed as crushing a burden upon the Central Powers as the Allies thought they could possibly endure. This Carthaginian peace was justified on the ground that Germany and her colleagues were solely responsible for causing the war. Competent historians have now abandoned the theory of the sole guilt of the Central Powers. But the Allied Governments still insist upon claiming the rights and privileges which were extorted from the vanquished and refuse to recognize the justice and necessity of making drastic changes in the peace treaties.

"Peace cannot permanetly be maintained if the winners insist upon preserving the *status quo* as fixed by

the iniquitous peace treaties. The Germans are utterly unreconciled to the award of the Danzig Corridor to Poland and eventually will fight for its recovery if a pacific adjustment of this controversy is not secured. They cannot and will not continue to make annual indemnity payments of half a billion dollars for the next forty or fifty years. The harboring of the illusion that peace can be preserved without making radical changes in the peace treaties will lead to tragic consequences." (National Defense, page 323.)

Imagine New England cut off from the rest of the United States by a corridor running down from Canada to Boston. Boston is as American as Danzig is German. Would American opinion long remain quiet in the face of cries of misgovernment and a desire to be united with the Homeland?

A review of American history will indicate somewhat more precipitate action than that followed by Germany in the case of Danzig and the Corridor. For this, an article by Fletcher Pratt in the American Mercury of December, 1938, entitled U. S. A.: THE AGGRESSOR NATION, will serve as a good illustration.

To cite the numerous statements of competent authorities condemning the Polish Corridor is beyond our scope.*

Winston Churchill, whose fickle judgement, from political season to political season, leaves one wondering for whose best interests he speaks, said this is the debate on the King's Speech, November 23, 1932, House of Commons (Hansard, 5th Series, Vol. 272):

". . . I would follow any real path, not a sham or a blind alley which led to lasting reconciliation between Germany and her neighbors . . . Removal of the just grievances of the vanquished ought to precede the disarmament of the victors. It would be safer to open questions like those of the Danzig Corridor and Trans-

*See Appendix IX.

sylvania with all their delicacy and difficulty in cold blood and in a calm atmosphere and while the victor-nations still have ample superiority, than to wait and drift on inch by inch, and step by step, until once again vast combinations equally matched confront each other face to face . . . We might find ourselves pledged in honour and in law to enter a war against our will and against our better judgment in order to preserve those very injustices and grievances which sunder Europe to-day, which are the cause of present armaments and which, if not arrested, will cause another war . . ."

Oh, fickle British Statesman for *whom* move you the tiller that has guided your country's Ship of State and the world into that very war of which you spoke?

In his book, DOWN THE YEARS, Sir Austin Chamberlain gives us an example of the British policy of aggression against the Continent. The Low Countries (Holland and Belgium) are encompassed by the extension of the British island shore frontiers across la Manche.

"For in truth," writes Sir Austin, "their frontier is our frontier and the destruction of their independence would be a fatal blow to our own." (Page 166.)

Joining forces twenty-five years later with this knight of British imperialism was a liberal democratic imperialist.

"Our frontier is on the Rhine," Franklin D. Roosevelt is reported to have said to a group of Senators at a White House Conference.

Liberal democratic imperialists—liberal with the territory of any country they conquer by an aggression masked in the idealism of a crusade—set up themselves as the arbiters of the frontiers of the world, not with justice, but by force of arms.

Sir Austin did concede, however, " . . . that we (England) have no direct interest in the Polish Corridor or Upper Silesia and certainly we are not called upon to

assume any particular responsibility in regard to them." Even on these frontiers, far removed from the Low Countries, Sir Austin was not too sure. "But who can predict with confidence," he wrote in the very next sentence, "that if they (the Polish Corridor and Upper Silesia—Ed.) gave rise to conflict, we should remain entirely unaffected and that the experience of 1914 might not be repeated?" (Page 165.)

With its Balance of Power policy, that heart of the British World Empire, removed from the mainland by the narrow width of la Manche (commonly miscalled the English Channel), has brought the disaster of war, death, and destruction to the Continent and the world and powerfully aided, in cooperation with an alien influence shielded in "The City",* the ascendancy of Bolshevism to its present dominant position in the affairs of the world.

Europe was not to be allowed to progress into social amity, and political and economic stability, under the leadership of the National Socialist Government of the Third Reich. This Government had brought notable improvement to the economic condition of Germany. The measures employed were domestic and internal. They effected no other countries, except as other countries chose to see a danger to their system of economic and financial exploitation of "Balkanized Europe" as the improved conditions in Germany began to spread throughout Europe.

It is difficult to find non-inflammatory books describing the improving conditions in Central Europe at this time. Samuel Untermeyer's declaration of a *holy war* on behalf of Organized World Jewry did immeasurable harm, as it was intended to do, to any fair reporting of the conditions in Europe. Honest scholarship disappeared under pressure from this strongly organized minority.

An American observer in Germany writes:

"Lurid as were the details of bodily mistreatment,

*See The Empire of "The City," by E. C. Knuth.

it must be emphatically stated that this form of National Socialist attack on Jewry was exaggerated by the foreign press far out of proportion to its importance in the German anti-Jewish movement and was as far removed from the general tone of German life as Negro lynchings in our South is from normal American life." (UNDER THE SWASTIKA, page 193, John B. Holt.)

Freda Utley gives us some idea why the details were lurid:

"The Soviet Government's suspicion that many of its citizens would escape from the socialist paradise if they could is probably justified. Perhaps Stalin has been wiser than Hitler in this respect. Whereas thousands of Jews and a goodly number of liberals have been allowed to leave Germany, and even former victims of the Gestapo have succeeded in getting out of the country to tell the tale of their sufferings to a horrified world, Stalin has shot or interned in concentration camps all whom he suspected of disliking the regime and has prevented even the "free' citizen from leaving the country for a short visit abroad. Consequently, whereas the horrors of Nazi Germany are known to the whole world, very few people know anything about the suffering and oppression of the Russians under Stalin." (DREAM WE LOST, page 306.)

(The reader will understand why Freda Utley's book "THE DREAM WE LOST is out of print and scarce.)

CHAPTER FIVE

Roping In America—1941

"The 'Intelligentsia,' supported by a special few with personal axes to grind is hell bent for war. A small but brilliant galaxy of political, academic, elite and socialite stars is driving 130 million Americans against their wishes and judgment into war: not just a war against Germany as in 1917, but a futile war to stop foreign revolution—a war that may last for a generation, cost millions of lives and billions of dollars, and accomplish nothing but the transformation of America into a social, economic and political shambles." (THE WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE REIGN OF TERROR, George Cless, Jr., Scribner Commentator, December, 1940.)

We now enter the period of the interventionist battle against attempts to keep America clear of the Second World War. A number of authoritative books are available which outline the efforts made to involve the United States in the coming catastrophe. Some are:

Porter Sargent, "Getting U. S. Into War."
Quincy Howe, "England Expects Every American to Do His Duty," and "Blood Is Cheaper Than Water."
Sidney Rogerson, "Propaganda In the Next War."
Walter Johnson, "Battle Against Isolation."
H. C. Gratton, "The Deadly Parallel."
Hubert Herring, 'And So To War."

"Never since the days of ancient Rome has so much power remained concentrated in so few hands for so long a period as in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and its overseas empire," writes Quincy Howe in the foreword of ENGLAND EXPECTS EVERY AMERICAN TO DO HIS DUTY. But now . . .

"The British Empire needs the support of the United States. It has had that support with various degrees of enthusiasm in every crisis, for over a hundred years. During

many of those years, American support was comforting but not indispensable. Since 1914 it has become imperative and it has sometimes been given with disastrous effects upon the United States." (AND SO TO WAR, page 116, Hubert Herring.)

To be remembered is the visit of Sir George Paish to this country in the summer of 1940. Senator Wheeler stated in the Senate, August 26, 1940, that Sir George had said to him:

"I am responsible for getting the United States into the last war. I am over here now and I am going across the United States on a speaking tour. I am going to get this country into this war."

The United States since the turn of the century has become the great pawn in world power politics.

Then there is the Polish diplomatic correspondence discovered in Warsaw by the Germans. Count Jerzy Potocki, Polish Ambassador to the United States, wrote from Washington, January 16, 1939, to the Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs in Warsaw (from photostatic copies of the original documents):

January 16, 1939

Embassy of the Republic of Poland
In Washington
No. 3/SZ-tjn-4 (confidential)
Re: Conversation with Ambassador Bullitt

To His Excellency, the Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs in Warsaw:

". . . From my conversation with Bullitt I had the impression that President Roosevelt had acquainted him in detail with the views of the United States in the present European crisis. Bullitt is to report to the Quai d'Orsay and is also to convey these views in his conversation with European statesmen. The content of these directions, of which B. informed me in our half hour conversation is as follows:

1) A new impulse in foreign policy inspired by President Roosevelt who sharply and emphatically condemns the totalitarian states.

2) The War-preparations of the United States on sea, on land and in the air which are being executed at an increasing speed at the colossal expense of $1,250,000,000.

3) The emphatic opinion of the President that France and Britain must make no further compromise with the totalitarian countries and must not allow themselves to be led into discussions regarding territorial changes.

4) A moral assurance that the United States are abandoning their policy of isolation and in case of war are ready to grant active support to Britain and France, America being prepared to place her whole financial and material resources at their disposal."

POTOCKI

In the face of this secretly declared foreign policy of the United States, what is likely to be the foreign policy of Britain? Freda Utley comments on this follows:

"Chamberlain and his group were forced to abandon the policy of appeasement by pressure from the Left at home, and their own growing doubts concerning Germany's intentions. The United States also played its part by exerting moral pressure on England to wage war on Germany next time the latter erupted. The anger, indignation, and contempt of the American people, as voiced by their press and their politicians, at the Munich settlement, were inflamed, if not actually instigated, by Communists and their fellow travelers, just as similar feelings were fanned in England and France. Read such liberal American journals as the New Republic and the Nation in the fall of 1938 for the clearest expression of Commintern propaganda at that time; propaganda concerned to make the American people

Printed in part in New York World Telegram, March 29, 1940.

believe that Chamberlain had sacrificed Czecho-slovakia out of fear of communism and love of fascism.

"If the influence of the Commintern had been confined to such journals as these and to the Left intellectual circles they represent, the damage would not have been great. But the Commintern line was reflected in almost the whole American Press and in the great English liberal and labor daily newspapers, influenced not only by false prophets, the facile journalists or blind idealists, from the Webbs and Louis Fischer to Vincent Sheean, Dorothy Thompson and Heywood Broun, but by the great majority of columnists and commentators. All these 'liberals' played down Soviet atrocities, purges, executions, and liquidations; and played up Germany's. They represented the world as divided up into Satanic aggressor powers and virtuous democratic powers, with Stalin's Russia endeavoring, as the purest of the pure, to awaken France and England to thir duty to crush Germany." (THE DREAM WE LOST, page 313.)

Let us turn to the domestic situation in the United States. Count Jerzy Potocki reported on it to his Government as follows:

Washington, January 12, 1939

Embassy of the Republic of Poland,
in Washington (Confidential)
No. 3/SZ tjn 3
Re: Internal political situation in U. S. A. (Public Opinion against Germany, the Jewish question)

To His Excellency, The Minister for Foreign Affairs in Warsaw:

"Public opinion in America nowadays expresses itself in an increasing hatred of everything Fascist, hatred of Chancellor Hitler and in fact everything connected with National Socialism. Above all, propaganda here is entirely in Jewish hands. Jews own practically 100 per cent of the broadcasting stations, cinema, organs and periodicals. Although American propaganda is somewhat rough-shod, and paints Germany as black as pos-

sible—they certainly know how to exploit religious persecutions and concentration camps—yet, when bearing public ignorance in America in mind, their propaganda is so effective that people here have no real knowledge of the true state of affairs in Europe. Nowadays the majority of Americans regard Chancellor Hitler and National Socialism as the greatest evil and the greatest danger that have befallen the world.

"The whole situation in this country constitutes an excellent forum for all classes of public speakers and for refugees from Germany and Czecho-Slovakia who are not backward in inflaming American public opinion with a torrent of anti-German abuse and villification. All these speakers extol American liberty and compare it with conditions in the totalitarian countries. It is interesting to observe that in this carefully thought-out campaign—which is primarily conducted against National Socialism—no reference at all is made to Soviet Russia. If that country is mentioned, it is referred to in a friendly manner and people are given the impression that Soviet Russia is part of the democratic group of countries. Thanks to astute propaganda, public sympathy in U. S. A. is entirely on the side of Red Spain.

"Side by side with this propaganda an artificial war-panic is also created. Americans are induced to believe that peace in Europe is hanging by a thread and that war is inevitable. No effort is spared to impress upon the American mind that in event of a world war the U. S. A. must take an active part in a struggle for freedom and democracy.

"President Roosevelt was first in the field to give expression to this hatred of Fascism. He had a two-fold purpose in mind: firstly, he wanted to divert American public opinion from difficult and complicated domestic problems, particularly, however, from the struggle that was going on between Capital and Labour. Secondly, by creating a war-panic and rumors of a European crisis, he wanted to induce Americans to endorse his

huge program of armaments, as that program was in excess of normal American requirements.

"Commenting on Roosevelt's first purpose, I must say that conditions on the American Labour Market are constantly growing worse; unemployment today already totals 12 millions. Federal and State administrative expenditure is increasing daily. The billions of dollars which the Treasury spends on relief work is the only factor which at present maintains a certain amount of peace and order in this country. So far there have been only the usual strikes and local unrest. But no one can say how long this State subsidy will continue. Public agitation and indignation, severe conflicts between private enterprise and enormous trusts on the one hand, and with labour circles on the other, have created many enemies for Roosevelt and caused him many sleepless nights. As to Roosevelt's second purpose, I can only add that, as an astute politician and expert on American mentality, he has succeeded in quickly and adroitly diverting public opinion from the true domestic situation and interesting that opinion in foreign policy.

"The *modus operandi* was perfectly simple. All Roosevelt had to do was to stage correctly, on the one hand, the menace of world-war brought about by Chancellor Hitler, while on the other hand, a bogey had to be found that would gabble about an attack on the U. S. A. by the totalitarian countries . . . The Munich Pact was indeed a godsend to President Roosevelt. He lost no opportunity in translating it as France's and England's capitulation to bellicose German militarism. As people say in this country, Hitler drew a gun on Chamberlain. In other words, France and England had no choice and had to conclude a most shameful peace.

"Furthermore, the brutal treatment meted out to the Jews in Germany as well as the problem of the refugees are both factors which intensify the existing hatred of everything connected with German National Socialism. In this campaign of hatred, individual Jew-

ish intellectuals such as Bernard Baruch, Lehman, Governor of New York State, Felix Frankfurter, the newly appointed Supreme Court Judge, Morgenthau, the Financial Secretary and other well-known personal friends of Roosevelt have taken a prominent part in this campaign of hatred. All of them want the President to become the protagonist of human liberty, religious freedom and the right of free speech. They want the President to punish all anti-Semitic agitation. This particular group of people, who are all in highly placed American official positions and who are desirous of being representatives of "true Americanism," and as "Champions of Democracy," are, in point of fact, linked with international Jewry by ties incapable of being torn asunder. For international Jewry—so intimately concerned with the interests of its own race—President Roosevelt's 'ideal' role as a champion of human rights was indeed a godsend. In this way Jewry was able not only to establish a dangerous centre in the New World for the dissemination of hatred and enmity, but it also succeeded in dividing the world into two warlike camps. The whole problem is being tackled in a most mysterious manner. Roosevelt has been given the power to enable him to enliven American foreign policy and at the same to create huge reserves in armaments for a future war which the Jews are deliberately heading for.

"It is easy for American domestic policy to divert public opinion in this country from an increasing anti-Semitic feeling. This is done by talking of the necessity for defending faith and individual liberty against the menace of Fascism."

JERZY POTOCKI

Ambassador of the Republic of Poland

Despite these powerful forces in the United States working for war, official quarters in Britain as late as March, 1939, had hopes of winning an economic war against Germany in their effort to avoid a resort to arms. We here quote a few short excerpts from a report by the

Polish Ambassador in London to his Minister of Foreign Affairs:

Political Report No. 6/2

Embassy of the Republic of Poland

ER/MR-No. 57-tj-122 London, March 9, 1939

Mr. Hudson's Trade Mission

"Today I lunched with Mr. Hudson, the Parliamentary Secretary for Overseas Trade . . . He is of the opinion that Italy's economy is so exhausted that she could afford to take no measure which would be detrimental to Britain. He also displayed much optimism in his judgment of the German problem and told me that, in his opinion: 'We are already almost out of the danger zone!'

"Germany, he added, is especially desirous of an economic understanding, Herr Funk being among those who advocated this most strongly. . . . The British Government were moreover determined not to abandon a single European market and not to renounce their economic advantages in favour of the German Reich. This attitude, however, did not mean that Great Britain wanted to contest Germany's first place in the various Central European market's which the latter country held for physical, geo-political and other reasons.

"Here Mr. Hudson expressed his confidence in a favourable development of events by saying: 'Today we are making negotiations in the economic sphere and shattering the German barter system. In the autumn we shall induce Goering to come to London, within a year we shall have brought about an agreement restricting armaments, within 18 months we shall have completely done away with the painful problem of colonial raw materials; in this manner we shall secure peace and reestablish the shattered political equilibrium.'

"The confidence thus displayed by Mr. Hudson in his Berlin discussions does not, however, prevent him from thinking about and mentioning a 'Policy for de-

veloping means of resistance.' In characterizing the attitude taken by his country, he asserted that British policy had now abandoned the methods and slogans of the last twenty years and had returned to those of her more aggressive days at the end of the nineteenth century, i. e. the time of Joseph Chamberlain. This necessarily meant a return to jingo tradition."

Of this fateful spring Karl von Wiegand wrote:

"On April 25, 1939, four months before the German invasion of Poland Ambassador William Christian Bullitt called me to the American Embassy in Paris to tell me:

" *'War in Europe has been decided upon.'*

" 'Poland,' he said, 'had the assurance of the support of Britain and France, and would yield to no demands from Germany.'

" 'America,' he predicted, 'would be in the war after Britain and France entered it.' " (Chicago Herald-American, Oct. 8, 1944.)

Confirming this, Arthur Sears Henning wrote on November 12, 1941:

'From the outbreak of the war the President has been under fire for permitting, if not encouraging, William C. Bullitt, American Ambassador to France and other American diplomats to encourage France and Poland to get into the war with promises of American support." (Washington Times Herald.)

Of the Churchill cables to Roosevelt, David Sentner wrote in the New York Journal American, June 19, 1945:

". . . that the Churchill-Roosevelt correspondence allegedly was following a course to bring the United States into war with Great Britain against Germany . . . Among the cables which were decoded (by Tyler Kent) and the contents revealed, Rep. Hoffman (R., Mich.) said 'It is alleged there was one sent by Churchill in Oc-

tober, 1939, in which Churchill then British Lord of the Admiralty states:

> " 'I am half American and a natural person to work with you. It is evident we see eye to eye. Were I to become Prime Minister of Britain we could control the world.' "*

It is anyone's judgment whether the United States was trying to "rope in England" for a crusade in the cause of "human rights" or whether England was trying to "rope in America" to save the Empire from the growing menace of world trade by barter. Hilaire Belloc had written a siginifcant editorial, CAN WE ROPE IN AMERICA? in The Weekly Review, London, on January 6, 1938, which we reprint in full:

> The immediate practical question in English politics has nothing domestic about it: for we have in truth no domestic politics. We are so united a country that no domestic question divides us. Our poor are delighted to be managed at a profit by our rich, we are always persuaded that, if any of us suffers, the foreigner anyhow suffers a great deal more and we are quite content with the purity of our public life and the magnificence of our public men.
>
> But in problems involving the said foreigners and the said public men and ourselves, in matters of international relationship it is otherwise. The Irish affair, which is the most important of all, we get over by taking for granted that it is not there. Ireland is excluded from our press, and not one of us in a thousand pays the least attention to it, or to the Irish Race, in Australia, Canada, America, or to the Irish religion. But what a few people do by this time appreciate, and what most people are beginning vaguely to feel, is the increasing menace to our wealth. We are menaced by serious rivals who want to get hold of that wealth. One important section of our wealth is derived from tribute

*See THE CASE OF TYLER KENT, John Howland Snow, noted in bibliography.

> beyond Singapore. As money lender (that is, bankers) we have levied on the Far East a regular toll, increasing in magnitude, for nearly a hundred years. We get five and six per cent and over from the labour of yellow men, who are still precariously and have long been securely, in our fee. We get profits from our exchange of goods with them; we get profits out of insurance upon their lives, upon fire, upon trade risks; we get, or have got, direct payment in salaries from them, paid to our public school men whom we send out as managers and officials of every sort; we get a big slice of their taxes as payment for 'accommodation,' and all the rest of it. Much the greater part of this wealth, steadily pumped out of the Far East, finds its way to England and maintains a respectable proportion of our population, some in idleness, others in not very laborious ease.
>
> The Japanese want this revenue and at the moment of this writing are in a fair way to get it. They want to deflect the wealth that is now paid into our pockets as money lenders, managers, insurers, exchangers, officials, and even missionaries, into their pockets. They propose to do this by force of arms and they have already gone a long way towards succeeding.
>
> Now how can they be stopped? Only by a superior force in action or by threat of such force sufficient to give them pause. Can we do that single-handed? We cannot, because we have not sufficient strength. We have no land force available for the purpose and sea power nowadays does not exercise the control it did thirty years ago. Even if it still could do what used to be claimed for it, we could not use it single handed because the attempt to do so would at once arouse an overwhelming coalition against us. The French in their present condition, though they have similar (vastly inferior) interests in the Far East, are not to be relied upon. The hopes we had of Russian interference have failed, the international clique which still rules from Moscow with Stalin as its vigorous figurehead, knows very well that foreign war would be the end of it.

There remains the United States.

It is commonly said up and down Europe that we can make the United States do what we like. That idea is based upon the vague and misleading word, "Anglo-Saxon," but also upon the actual and recent experience of the last 20 years. We got the U. S. into the Great War on our side, and what was more extraordinary, we managed, in the debt business, to make France the villain of the piece. We have got them to feel with us against modern Italy, and we have got them to talk of ourselves as "a democracy"—which is prodigious.

Can we rope them in to fight, or threaten to fight, the Japanese? It is a question of the most poignant interest, and it is a question that will be answered in a comparatively short time one way or the other.

The advantages we have in the working of American opinion and policy are very great, and they have been used in the past with so much success that those who think we shall still win the trick and have much to say for themselves. We are the only people of the Old World who use the same printed word, and largely the same spoken word, as the Americans. Much more important than that mechanical advantage is the spiritual advantage of a literature largely in common with them and an interpretation (or myth) of general history held largely in common with them. But much more important than any other factor is the religious factor. Vastly different as we are from the Americans we have in common with them the set of moral ideas proceeding from men who dominated the English seventeenth century. Those ideas have of course been transformed in the last 200 years. You can make more out of a Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals or Children, or out of the word "democracy," or out of "sanitation," than you can out of the Authorized Version, and much more than you can out of direct Calvinism, for the latter has now got to be diluted; but, roughly speaking, we know instinctively what will move American indignation and

enthusiasm, even when it does not move our own. American opinion is inflammable, and just as we got up the cry, 'To hell with the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs" (which both begin withn an "h"), so we might get a slogan for the Pacific.

There are abstacles in the way. The chief of these is the very large American investment in Japan (17 times that of the British—Ed.). The next obstacle in importance is the realization by most Americans that we are much more interested than they are in stopping the Japanese advance, and that, if they come in, they will be coming in much more to our advantage than to their own. But those obstacles could be overcome. The mass of the American public has no experience, as we have, of modern war; its enthusiasm is easily aroused; we have already got them to feel a sort of instinctive opposition to the Italians; and the Jews and ourselves combined and in alliance have got them to oppose the Third Reich.

Roughly speaking, we are about half way to our goal. Shall we be able to go the remaining half of the way and reach our goal? Shall we rope in America against Japan? That is the important question of the moment, and as this paper is free to tell the truth, the truth can be stated here in its simple and obvious terms. As things now stand, our chances are (to put it in American) about fifty-fifty. (End of quotation.)

Now let us turn to Beverly Nichols, English and author and journalist. This is what he says about the alliance between England and the Jews referred to by Belloc:

"Let us regard anti-semitism from a purely utilitarian point of view. Is it for a moment conceivable that the British Empire which is of all institutions the most precarious and the most ramshakly could possibly tear out the Jews from its midst and continue to survive? The briefest consideration assures us that if it attempted such a drastic surgical operation, it would crash in ruins. It would crash as certainly as an ancient build-

ing on which the ivy had for centuries encroached. You may call the ivy a parasite, you may suggest that it has stretched its tendrills too deeply into crevices, that it was eating into the very fabric of the stone. That may be true. But try to tear it away and you will bring down not only the ivy, but the entire structure.

"Would it not be better to trim the ivy?

"I do not think that the metaphor is either inappropriate or far fetched. The ivy is a parasite. The Jew is a parasite. But the ivy on an ancient structure is not only a parasite but a support. And the Jew in an ancient structure like the British Empire is not only an alien but an asset." (NEWS OF ENGLAND, A Country Without a Hero, , page 299.)

In the same year, 1938, Sidney Rogerson wrote in PROPAGANDA IN THE NEXT WAR:

"There remain the Jews. It has been estimated that of the world population of approximately fifteen million, no fewer than five millions are in the United States. Twenty-five per cent of the inhabitants of New York are Jews (now roughly 50 per cent—Ed.). During the Great War we bought off this huge American Jewish public by the promise of a Jewish National Home in Palestine, held by Ludendorff to be the master stroke of Allied propaganda as it enabled us not only to appeal to the Jews in America but to the Jews in Germany as well. Since then our attempts to implement our undertaking have landed us in difficulties with the indigenous Arabs, agitated by Italian propaganda, without satisfying the Jews. We have not satisfied the educated British Jews. How much less have we satisfied the more remote Jew community on the other side of the Atlantic. In addition, the recent realist policy of the British Government has been worked up into a propaganda of significant extent and intensity which represents Great Britain as being "half-Fascist'—excuse the label—all ready and prepared to 'sell the democratic pass" and go "all-Fascist' at the first convenient opportunity. This is being developed by the intense Jewish hatred of Germany, and from her of all dictator countries, and backed by the influence of the Catholic Church and undenominational liberals. At the moment we have a strong section of American opinion against us, but if war were to break out tomorrow between England and Germany this mass of opinion would have to come down on one side or the other and it will be marvelous indeed if German propaganda could succeed in bringing it down on theirs. In general the situation in the United States is more favourable to Great Britain than in 1914, in that the obvious centre of infection has been removed; but less favourable in that we have temporarily, at any rate, lost caste as a 'democratic' State because of the propaganda which represents us as truckling to or at least having truck with the 'dictators.' Though we are not unfavourably placed to keep the United States benevolently neutral, to persuade her to take our part will be more difficult, so difficult as to be unlikely to succeed. It will need a definite threat to America, a threat, moreover, which will have to be brought home by propaganda to every citizen, before the republic will again take arms in an external quarrel. The position will be naturally considerably eased if Japan were involved and this might and probably would bring America in without further ado. At any rate, it would be a natural and obvious object of our propagandists to achieve this, just as during the Great War they succeeded in embroiling the United States with Germany." (Page 147.)

On January 12, 1939, The Weekly Review (London) published a leading article, THE BANKERS ACT, which, because of its importance, we quote in full:

A bitter struggle is going on as to how international trade and international financial relations shall be conducted in the future. On the one side are the banking nations—notably England and the United States—together with those countries which have found it expedient to side with them, and on the other, the authori-

tarian States of whom Italy and Germany are the leading examples.

The quarrel, reduced to its simplest terms, consists in the question whether or not the usurious loan system shall continue to be the basis of international—and in a secondary degree, national—dealings. A nation's success in it is dependent upon two things which are supplementary to each other: a strong gold backing and the possession of the machinery of world banking. Granting the continuance of the system as a world habit, a country possessing these two advantages is able to impose its will on its other less fortunate neighbors, for it has the power to dry up their resources of wealth and make it impossible or very difficult for them to carry on. Nor is it an easy task to break the system and thus win economic freedom. This can only be done by determination on the part of the rulers of the revolting country backed by preponderant military strength.

Through all modern history the power exercised by money has been challenged by monarchies and the reason for this is that a monarchy is a monarchy only in name until it has subordinated to itself, and thus destroyed, the effectual supremacy of the banker. A banking monarchy is a contradiction in terms. It is thus not surprising that the new monarchies (for Germany, though not strictly speaking a monarchy, possesses many of the characteristics of that type of government) now that they have attained to a position of military strength, should set their faces against any sort of subordination to the world banking system.

The battle is joined, and on a vaster scale than any similar struggle of the past.

The methods adopted by the opponents of the money power have been largely forced upon them by circumstances and made possible by the strict disciplinary regime they have set up within their respective countries. They refuse foreign interest-bearing loans (and as far as possible repudiate those previously con-

tracted), and obtain the imports that they require by direct exchange of goods, subsidizing where necessary, their own exports to an unlimited extent. Such subsidies, which are rendered possible by governmental control of labour, raw materials, etc., naturally cause strains and stresses in the internal economy of the population, especially since so large a proportion of the imported goods are the raw materials for armaments, but the currency of the country remains practically unaffected, and the disasters of headlong inflation are avoided.

On the other side the banking nations, which depend for their prosperity on the issuing of loans, bearing high interest, to nations in economic difficulties, and on the speeding up of international trade to make the payment of that interest possible, are being hard hit by repudiation, contraction of their borrowing field, and a severe check upon international trade as they understand it. England is especially feeling the brunt of the attack, partly because she is of all nations the least self-sufficient, and partly because of the enormous expenditures on armaments that she has recently undertaken. Evidence of the strain she is feeling has been apparent in the steady fall in the value of the pound sterling.

At the end of last week the Government took action. It transferred no less than three hundred and fifty million pounds' worth (reckoning at the present value of the pound) of bar gold from its function as backing to the currency to the new function of supporting the Exchange Equalization Fund, which is another way of keeping the pound from falling further, particularly when a serious beginning is made of subsidizing our own manufactured exports to compete with foreign subsidies. This action, which in itself amounts to no more than transferring one's purse from one pocket to another, had the immediate effect of slightly raising the value of the pound; for those who control these things cannot refrain from admiration of any nation that publicly manipulates a large sum of money. But the ultimate intention behind the action is a more serious busi-

ness. It is a challenge to the nations who are revolting from what has become the orthodox money system, to the effect that England is prepared to expend this gigantic sum in breaking the revolt.

It is a proud gesture, but one unlikely to prove successful, for it is pitting capital against savings from labour. The savings will persist while the capital diminishes.

But the really tragic thing about England's part in this struggle is not her possible failure but that she is on the wrong side. It is one thing for her to refuse for herself the authoritarian regimes of the continent; it is quite a different one to waste her resources on trying to perpetuate a system which is as subversive of freedom and productive of war as the most tyrannical of despotisms and far more widely extended.

"If she desires appeasement, it is madness to attack the virtues of those with whom she would live in peace. (End of quotation.)

A careful study of this article places an entirely different light on the "Fight For Freedom" we have heard so much about. It would appear that the so-called liberal, democratic nations, who happen to be at the same time the banking nations, have gathered to themselves the freedom of the whole world. They are engaged, with a great show of piety, in sharing it out in a kind of share-croppers proposition, with the nations who are proving themselves to be righteous. But apparently proof of righteousness is judged by a nation's subservience to the banking interests, that is, to world finance.

It is not surprising, all facts considered, that there was to be no mediation of the Danzig-Corridor problem.

One reason, Winston Churchill, fickle helmsman-to-be of Britain's Ship of State, now had other words to say than those he had said in the House of Commons on November 23, 1932 (see page 45).

"Germany is getting too strong—*we must smash Germany.*"*

Assertedly these words were spoken to American General Robert Wood, who, according to his testimony, had been a luncheon guest at Churchill's London flat. There was no one else present, "all I could give the Senators is my word as a gentleman," said the General. (Hearings on S. 275, Lend Lease, February, 1941, pp. 338-390.)

And the twenty years' armistice ended September 1, 1939.

The fighting war began in Europe and the battle to involve the United States began at home. For eight months after the restoration of Danzig to Germany there was no fighting of consequence. Had sanity ruled the governments of the liberal democracies they could have stopped the conflict. But there was no sanity.

England depended on the United States coming in—with good reason!

The war against Germany had been going on covertly from the time of Samuel Untermeyer's startling broadcast. (See page 38.)

To the sixteenth convention of the B'nai B'rith, held some eight months before Pearl Harbor, Mr. Sigmund Liv-

*But in his Zurich, Switzerland address, September 19, 1946, the fickle Mr. Churchill said: "I wish to speak to you today about the tragedy of Europe. This noble continent, comprising on the whole the fairest and the most cultivated regions of the earth, enjoying a temperate and equable climate, is the home of all the great parent races of the Western world. It is the foundation of the Christian faith and Christian ethics.

"And what is the plight to which Europe has been reduced? . . . over wide areas a vast quivering mass of tormented, hungry, careworn and bewildered human beings gaze on the ruins of their cities and scan the dark horizon for the approach of some new peril, tyranny or terror. (See Appendix VII, page 103.)

"Among the victors there is a babel of voices, among the vanquished a sullen silence of despair.

'I am now going to say something that will astonish you. The first step in the re-creation of the European family must be a partnership between France and Germany . . . There can be no revival of Europe without a spiritually great France and a spiritually great Germany." (New York Times, September 20.)

ingston, chairman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, submitted a written message wherein he rationalized American entry into the war as a necessary step for combatting anti-Semitism. He stated:

> "No nation can stand by, oblivious to the perpetration of a great national wrong (the persecution of the Jews by the Nazis) without becoming an accessory to that wrong, if it has the power, either solely or jointly with others, to stop or remedy such wrong."

Thus Mr. Livingston enunciated the doctrine that any American who upheld traditional American neutrality was an accessory to the crime of anti-Semitism in Germany.*

For various political, financial, racial and social reasons, influential groups in the United States favored involvement, regardless of the harm done to their own country and to the world. President Roosevelt and other highly placed Americans were among those who actively worked, not to keep America out, but to get America in. The Chicago Tribune published this report of the President's war plans on December 4, 1941:

F. D. R.'S WAR PLANS!

Goal Is 10 Million Armed Men; Half to Fight in A. E. F.
Proposed Land Drive By July 1, 1943, to Smash Nazis;
President Told of Equipment Shortage

Washington, D. C., Dec. 3.—A confidential report prepared by the joint Army and Navy high command by direction of President Roosevelt calls for American expeditionary forces aggregating 5,000,000 men for a final land offensive against Germany and her satellites. It contemplates total armed forces of 10,045,658 men.

One of the few existing copies of this astounding document, which represents decisions and commitments affecting the destinies of peoples throughout the civilized world, became available to The Tribune today.

*A Trial on Trial (page 62), Maximilian St. George and Lawrence Dennis, National Civil Rights Committee.

It is a blueprint for total war on a scale unprecedented in at least two oceans and three continents, Europe, Africa and Asia.

The report expresses the considered opinion of the army and navy strategists that "Germany and her European satellites cannot be defeated by the European powers now fighting against her." Therefore, it concludes, "if our European enemies are to be defeated it will be necessary for the United States to enter the war, and to employ a part of its armed forces offensively in the Eastern Atlantic and in Europe and Africa."

July 1, 1943, is fixed as the date for the beginning of the final supreme effort by American land forces to defeat the mighty German army in Europe.

A Plan For Encirclement

In the meantime, however, increasingly active participation is prescribed for the United States, to consist of the gradual encirclement of Germany by the establishment of military bases, an American air offensive against Germany from bases in the British Isles and in the Near East, and possible action by American expeditionary forces in Africa and the Near East. (End of quote)

That was December 4th, 1941, three days before Pearl Harbor.

The next day Britain's Julian Huxley landed in New York and made this statement to the press:

> "Personally, I hope Japan won't back down and that you'll have to go to war with her next week." (New York Journal American, December 5, 1941.)

The joint proclamation by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on August 14, 1941—their so-called Atlantic Charter—was the confirmation of a program for war already decided upon. On July 9th the President had written to Secretary of War Stimson asking that he explore "at once the over-all production requirements required to defeat our potential enemies."

The statement of former Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson to the Congressional Joint Committee of the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack brought from Mr. Hamilton Fish, former congressman from New York the following statement:

"The shocking and amazing revelations of former Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson prove conclusively that charges made by me and other leading non-interventionists in Congress that President Roosevelt and his specially selected Cabinet of ardent and militant interventionists manoeuvred us into war against the will of 80 per cent of the American people.

"The Stimson quotations from his dairy have done more to establish the fact that President Roosevelt and Secretaries Hull, Knox and Stimson deliberately planned and sought to involve us in a war with Japan and with Germany, through the back door, than all the testimony taken by the Pearl Harbor investigating committee.

"Mr. Stimson openly states that the note sent by Secretary of State Hull on November 26, 1941, ten days before Pearl Harbor, was a war ultimatum to Japan. This is the main fact that the Democratic members of the committee sought so strenuously to keep out of the record, and actually denounced it as sheer politics and lies. This directly vindicates every statement made by non-interventionists prior to Pearl Harbor, who for years have been villified and smeared by paid agents for telling the truth.

"The complete vindication now comes from no less a person than Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War at the time, who was appointed by President Roosevelt because of his pronounced international and interventio ist views. The truth is mighty, and history does not lie." (New York Daily News, March 26, 1946.)

Oliver Lyttleton's statement in London as reported by the United Press on June 20, 1944, justifies Mr. Fish's

criticism of Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson and the interventionists. Mr. Lyttleton said:

"'Japan was provoked into attacking the Americans at Pearl Harbor. It is a travesty on history ever to say that America was forced into the war.'

"Mr. Lyttleton authorized his secretary to say that he did not dispute the published version of his statement but that he made his remarks in an aside and phrased them badly."

The campaign for intervention culminated in the attack on Pearl Harbor. Of this John J. O'Donnell writes in Capitol Stuff (New York Daily News, August 13, 1945):

"The reporters in Washington on that Sunday afternoon were as much shocked and surprised as were the Army and Navy commanders at Pearl Harbor. Certainly on Sunday, December 7, 1941, the newsmen didn't know that F. D. R. definitely had threatened war on August 17 . . . (It was on that Sunday, August 17, that the great decision of the Roosevelt-Churchill conference at sea was put into effect: Roosevelt, swift to keep his secret pledge to Churchill, called in Jap Ambassador Nomura and delivered the oral ultimatum. In effect, F. D. R. told Japan that if they didn't stop making moves in the Pacific which disturbed Britain, then in its life and death struggle with Germany, the Japs could expect to be at war with the United States) . . . Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt was apparently better informed . . . In September, 1944, she gave a highly significant interview printed in the Sunday magazine section of the New York Times. Times reporter Kathleen McLaughlin reported in her Sunday piece: . . . 'she (Mrs. Roosevelt) recalls there was only a little more commotion than usual following receipt that morning (December 7, 1941) by the President of the historic message from Pearl Harbor . . . December 7 was just like any other D-days to us . . . it was far from the shock it proved to be to the country in general. We had expected something for a long time.'"

Former Prime Minister Churchill has made some interesting comments on the entry of the United States into the War. Shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor he said in the House of Commons:

> "When I survey and compute the power of the United States and its vast resources and feel that they are now in it with us, with the British Commonwealth of Nations, all together, however long it lasts, till death or victory, I cannot believe that there is any other fact in the whole world which can compare with that. This is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for, and now it has come to pass." (February 16, 1942.)

Later we learn from His Majesty's war time Prime Minister that the Atlantic Conference put its stamp of approval on a program of "blood, sweat and tears" for these United States. The Prime Minister said in the House of Commons:

> "It has been the policy of the cabinet at almost all costs to avoid embroilment with Japan until we were sure that the United States would also be engaged . . . On the other hand, the probability since the Atlantic Conference, at which I discussed these matters with President Roosevelt, *that the United States, even if not attacked, would come into the war in the East* and thus make final victory assured. . . . has not been falsified by the events." (January 28, 1945.)*

*See Boake Carter, page 5; Hilaire Belloc, page 60; Sidney Rogerson, page 63.

CHAPTER SIX

Other Influences

> "By the proper handling of their invention, Nineteenth Century Money, the London merchants managed to regulate and to limit the imports and exports of every country in the world. Beyond that they even controlled and directed the development of business, of industry and of production in every quarter of the globe. And by their wise handling of their tremendous international power the London merchants achieved the reasonably smooth development of the rapidly growing world economy in the age of steam and electricity.
>
> "This was England's Service to the world, and this is the service she must resume and continue to render in any reasonably constituted world. There is no other nation that can pretend to render that service. It was the breakdown of this service that brought misery, unrest and war into the world." (Sarpedon, England's Service,* pages 120-121.)

The beginning of the war gave expression to feelings of satisfaction in many quarters. In the Zionist Review (London), October 26, 1939, David Ben-Gurion wrote (Jewry's Tasks, page 7):

> "Our entire fate is bound up with that of Great Britain. Her war is our war."

The American Hebrew, The National Weekly of Jewish affairs, expressed its views in its Editorial Interpretations of Current Events on July 24, 1942, as follows:

> "It may seem a far cry from the Philippines and the war to the peacefully developing movement for better understanding between Christians and Jews in the United States. But is it? Whenever an American or Philippino fell at Bataan or Corregidor or any of the

*See Appendix VI.

now historic spots where MacArthur's men put up their remarkable fight, their survivors could have said with truth: the real reason that boy went to his death was because Hitler's anti-Semitic movement succeeded in Germany."

But nine years previously the Jews had greeted enthusiastically the *holy war* on which they themselves were embarked, according to Samuel Untermeyer (see page 38).

It would appear that Mr. Untermeyer and Mr. Baruch have been the joint chiefs of staff of some kind of a supernational war planning board. Mr. Baruch seemed to know what he was talking about when he told General George C. Marshall in 1938:*

"We are going to lick that fellow Hitler. He isn't going to get away with it." (As reported in the New York Times, May 25, 1944.)

Samuel Untermeyer and Bernard Baruch did a great deal to promote among the Jewish people enthusiasm for an American war against Germany.

Rev. John Haynes Holmes, a staunch supporter of "the peacefully developing movement for a better understanding between Christians and Jews," wrote in Opinion (September, 1940), an influential journal of Jewish life and letters edited by Hungarian-born Rabbi Stephen S. Wise:

"And now the Jews are actually clamoring for war again, under the insane delusion that this new war can bring any different or better results than the last war! If the Jews know what is good for them, to say nothing of what is good for Europe and the world, they will

General Marshall, now Secretary of State, told Manuel de Goes Monteiro (former War Minister of Brazil) in 1939 that the United States was planning to enter the war beside England. Monteiro said, in levelling this sensational charge at the new Secretary of State, that Marshall conferred with high Brazilian officials and asked for and got a pledge of Brazilian cooperation. Monteiro returned to the United States with Marshall and the ground work for the cooperation was laid in Washington. A second visit by Monteiro in 1940 completed the plans. (From text of broadcast by Prescott Robinson, 8:00 A.M., January 9, 1947, as supplied by Radio Station WOR.)

do everything in their power to stop this war, and especially to keep America out of it. If this war goes on, with Jews doing their part to foment it and feed it and idealize it, Europe will be plunged a decade hence into a horror of anti-Semitism which will make Hitler's pogroms look like a Sunday School kindergarten. If America gets into this war and is fooled again, our wealth wasted and the lives of our boys thrown away the second time for no result save that of utterly wrecking our civilization and ending democracy forever, then a wave of anti-Semitism, already started in this country, will sweep the land with horror. Disillusioned and desperate Americans are in no way different from disillusioned and desperate Germans. They will seek a scapegoat for their own folly just as quickly and infallibly. I can hear now the cries which will be lifted a decade hence, if we go into this war today. 'The Jews did it!' They took us into the war because they hated Hitler. They own the newspapers. They run the movies. They control the banks. The Jews did it. Down with the Jews.'"

Some further influences of World Finance are worthy of note here. Jeffery Mark, an English writer on monetary affairs, says:

"Hitler in effect has declared a tentative war against international finance and all foreign loaned capital, and it is certain that a large amount of the opposition generated against his manifestly sincere internal reconstruction policy in Germany is due to this fact. France is working hand in hand with international finance, using the catspaw of the League of Nations to tighten her stranglehold on Germany through the financial control of the surrounding nations, and a servile and finance-suborned press has been deliberate in its efforts to discredit Germany throughout the world by the dragging of red herrings of all shapes and smells across the trail. The policy of the Nazis is instinctively rather than factually in opposition to international finance, but the seeds of a conflict of tremendous dimensions are already

sown; and it looks as if the powers of usury will force Great Britain to join France in an effort to crush Germany today, just as they forced her to fight a battle for usury, in combination with Germany against the Continental System of Napoleon in the last century." (MODERN IDOLATRY, page 222.)

A British diplomat has written, I cannot place the source:

"Britain has no eternal friends; Britain has only eternal interests."

But Mr. F. A. Voigt, probably the greatest living journalist interpreting British policy, and editor of the Nineteenth Century and After, wrote in that publication in September 1943:

"England has no one permanent foe in Europe, for none of her vital interests conflict with the interests of any European power. Her only foe is that power, or that coalition of powers, which may endeavor to dominate Europe. Against that foe she must always be ready, always strong, and always have allies. As her foe varies, so her allies vary. The foe of yesterday may be the ally of tomorrow and the ally of yesterday the foe of tomorrow."

Truly the VAMPIRE OF THE CONTINENT.

There is much evidence that the control of the issuance of money has been an important factor in American politics and diplomacy from the time of Alexander Hamilton to the formation of the Federal Reserve Banking System in 1913. It is interesting to note that Paul M. Warburg, a German-born Jew, with international banking connections, had much influence in its formation. Mr. Warburg is the author of a two-volume work entitled, THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, ITS ORIGIN AND GROWTH. Lincoln secured Congressional permission to issue money based on the work and wealth of the nation. His assassination followed*

*See Appendix I.

Robert J. Scrutton, in his book, A PEOPLES RUNNYMEDE, writes an enlightening chapter entitled "The Peace We Lost." We quote in part:

It is hypocrisy to condemn economic or military aggressors or dictators, no matter how ruthless they may be in their commercial or military war, if we will not remove the economic causes of the aggression or the condition which give rise to dictatorships.

The nations which were in the category of the "have nots" were treated as we treat our unemployed. "Our economic policy has no provision for exchanging goods and services without the use of money, but as the system cannot give you money we must withhold the goods you need. We are sorry for your condition, but bear your troubles peacefully; any attempt at violence to obtain a sufficiency of food, warmth and shelter will be crushed by the forces of law and order." This is the only implication we can give to Mr. Eden's words on September 20, 1937, after Germany and other countries had asked for assistance in solving their food problems:

"I am afraid no modification of the British or any other preferential system can provide an adequate remedy for the difficulties of those countries which, by maintaining exchange control, find themselves at a disadvantage in obtaining imports of raw materials and other things which they require. For as the Committee's report clearly shows, the principal difficulties of these countries arises not in obtaining raw materials, whether from colonial areas or elsewhere, but in paying for those raw materials."

The great commercial nations—America, Great Britain and France—had lent, and were willing to continue lending, money to foreign countries so that they could buy their goods. But Italy had learned her lesson by past experience and refused to entangle herself in debt. She occasionally ignored orthodoxy and fed her people by exchanging abroad her industrial products for the food she could not produce herself. Russian also of-

fended against the commercial powers by exchanging goods for goods. They were condemned by the world's economic experts. Barter was not accepted as legitimate trade. *It did not gather interest.* (Italics ours.—Ed.) Trade was trade, in the opinion of the money power, only when men stood at ports entering cargoes into ledgers headed "Imports and Exports." *Barter only fed people.* (Italics ours—Ed.)

Germany, like Italy and Russia before, was trying to escape the entanglements of world debt. England was quite willing to lend money to buy raw materials, but they insisted upon exchanging goods for goods. They would not be drawn into the system of increasing debt, booms and slumps. The Time (London) has since said that Germany's barter system made her an aggressor in the world market.* She was trying to break the credit ring of the money monopolists by the force of economic sanity—and that was unforgivable. She was acting like a worker who went on strike against a system which deprived him of adequate food supplies though he was quite willing to exchange his labour to pay for them.

---

*From The Times (London), October 11 and 12 and November 13, 1940:

One of the fundamental causes of this war has been the unrelaxing efforts of Germany since 1918 to secure wide enough foreign markets to straighten her finances at the very time when all her competitors were forced by their own debts to adopt exactly the same course. Continuous friction was inevitable.

Germany adopted a new monetary policy after which, The Times says, "Germany ceased to experience any serious financial difficulty."

In this country the people suffer the burdens of heavy and increasing taxation, but in Germany, says The Times:

"Nothing is ever heard of the necessity of increasing taxation, compulsory savings, or the issue of enormous public war loans. Quite the contrary. Recently an important tax was abolished. Public savings bank deposits touch new monthly records again and again. Money is so plentiful that the interest rate on the Reich loans could recently be reduced from 4½ to 4 per cent."*

We are told, "These changes may well call for drastic readjustments in our established conventions. A hidebound persistence in methods and doctrines which were sound fifty years ago may easily prove as costly in the financial and economic field of actual war. It might not lose the war; it would certainly lose the peace."

---

*The Bank of England and the Federal Reserve Banking System long ago discovered this. It makes a difference who does it—a people governing themselves, or a small minority ruling over them.—Ed.

In 1937 Hitler had said:

"Germany will enter into no more obligations to pay for her goods imports than she is capable of fulfilling. The German Government thus takes the standpoint of the respectable merchant, who keeps his orders in harmony with his power to pay."

He said:

"We laugh at the time when our national economists held the view that the value of a currency is regulated by the gold and securities lying in the vaults of a State Bank; and more especially we laugh at the theory that its value was guaranteed thereby. We have instead come to learn that the value of a currency lies in the productive capacity of a nation."

The world financial monopoly stood aghast. If Germany succeeded in her plan of economic penetration, other nations might follow her example. The whole world would then exchange goods for goods on a basis of equality and good fellowship! No one would want to borrow, and the financial pyramid of debt, from the apex of which Almighty Finance ruled the world, would collapse! Humanity would be well fed, but the financiers would lose their power.

The politicians said the barter system of Germany and other people was sure to fail. It had to fail to prove orthodoxy right.

In 1933 one third of America's cotton crop had been ploughed into the earth. In other parts of the world two-thirds of the rubber plantations were allowed to go to waste. Many countries wanted cotton and rubber but had no money with which to buy it. They were willing to exchange goods for these commodities, but direct trade (upon which High Finance could not exact its toll of debt and interest) was not satisfactory, so the planters tottered into bankruptcy, whilst Germany, with characteristic thoroughness, used substitutes for cotton and produced synthetic rubber. When denied oil she

produced it from coal.

If the German monetary experiment had been allowed to develop on the basis of a friendly exchange of goods it would have provided the world with useful information to assist it in solving its commercial problems. What may have been a laudable effort on the part of Germany has become a world war—a war of ideas in which Hitler strives to form a European economic monopoly opposed to the financial monopolies of the world, and does not hesitate to use every means to gain his goal of world economic power.

About this time other nations began to break through the money ring. Germany not only threatened the markets of the great trading nations but she had set an example which other countries were not slow to follow. First Russia had incurred hostility for refusing to pay her debts. Now Germany was incurring hostility for refusing to contract new ones.

Before Germany began her economic policy the one-time Allies had been glaring at each other with fear and suspicion; everyone was afraid of someone else—an unknown foe—but now they had found their enemy.

Statesmen began to prepare the public mind for war. No mention was made of the real causes of the crisis, the bitter scramble for world markets, the trickery, and the inhuman methods used to obtain spheres of influence for surplus investments and for increasing the burden of world debt. Statesmen were again preparing to sacrifice the youth of their contry on the bloody altar of Mammon. As in peace, so in war. Humanity must be sacrificed to save a worthless economic system.

"Once again the peoples were told that if they destroyed the leader of the German nation all would be well with the world. Germany worshipped its leader. Britain trusted its Government. Both peoples believed their leaders would save the world. It was a tragedy of faith in men. One nation has to fight for a new economic and political system and is willing to use any

means to get them; the others to preserve old ones—but the solution lies in neither.

Once again men, women, and children are being mown down in bloody swathes because the ports and granaries of some nations are glutted with goods and others empty. Surely the wrath of God will descend upon the statesmen who will not give humanity a secure place in the world where they can be fed and clothed, and live without fear, but by their practices must aggravate each other, and each generation strew the fruitful earth with the corpses of their children.

On public platforms politicians talked empty words. Rarely was it suggested that the surplus food might be distributed amongst their own people. Instead they were preparing to fight other nations to make them buy it. One cannot blame the politicians who got their economics from text-books which have never been changed for over a hundred years. They had been taught to think in terms of economics, not in terms of human need. They talked moral platitudes but never seriously thought of linking economics with moral justice.

Ludwell Denny, in America Conquers Britain, indicates the irony of a situation which impoverishes the exporting nation and produces war abroad:

"It seems to mean that if we work very hard, we can send more wealth abroad and thus acquire more capital abroad, and thus possibly receive still more capital abroad, and so on, generation after generation without finding any way whereby we, or our children, or our children's children can benefit greatly by our increased productivity.

"According to this theory, our own standard of living must remain the same as though we had never produced all this 'surplus' wealth. The complacency with which this theory is accepted is amazing."

Under the existing system, the impossibility of sharing out the raw materials and resources of the

world in accordance with the needs of the people of each nation, the impossibility of the people of any country being able to purchase and enjoy the wealth they are able to produce, would seem too obvious even to question.

If a nation cannot sell its goods to its own people then it must try to sell them abroad; if this cannot be done then the people will find themselves without jobs until the "surplus" goods are sold, and suffer poverty in the midst of their abundance. They must fight for foreign markets as it is impossible for all nations to increase their exports and to decrease their imports at the same time, so there can never be peace. Our statesmen do not tell us this simple truth.

Behind the alleged motives of dictators, national pride and honour, racial and religious antipathies, external dangers, and the sedulous fostering in consequence of human pugnacity and quarrelsomeness which produce war, economic causes of a much more humble and sordid nature are always at work. But the people are led to believe that they fight to preserve national honour. Yet what honour can any nation possess when its very life depends on a ruthless economic expansion where all decent human values and the well being of the peoples of other nations are forgotten?

To gain a foreign market means the loss of that market to another nation. The nation which loses its foreign market suffers a trade depression. The standard of living of its people must be lowered in order to undercut the prices of other nations in the world market. What honour is there to a victorious commercial nation whose success has brought disaster and misery to millions of people in another country? (End of quote.)

Karl von Wiegand reports from Madrid on the Potsdam Conference (New York Journal American, August 5, 1945). His article is entitled "Potsdam Planted Seeds of War.":

"After stating that the German nation and people will not be destroyed" . . . the three peace makers . . . "proceed with what can scarcely be interpreted as other than Germany's destruction . . . Germany will be practically destroyed economically . . . Once America's second best foreign trade customer and Britain's third best, but also a large exporter and formidable rival of the two countries for foreign markets, Germany, it is decreed, will be destroyed and removed root and branch, both as customer and as competitor."

The errors of the Treaty of Versailles are to be repeated. At this point we refer the reader to T. St. John Gaffney's report on England prior to 1914 on page 13- and to Arthur Bryant's report after the last peace on page 35. The similarity of the periods covered by these reports is striking.

It would appear that the same influences making the previous peace are at work again.

"Will it never end? . . . Or is there a curse on us all: on all our pacts, treaties and covenants?" asks William B. Orton in his book, TWENTY YEARS ARMISTICE (see page 28).

Evidently the curse has not been removed.

Von Wiegand continues:

'Before the war the Germans were one of the three countries in Europe who had the highest standard of wages, living and social security. In keeping with the Morgenthau Plan, Germany will . . . be reduced mainly to an agricultural state, doomed to poverty, and the German people condemned to long years of virtual serfdom to the victors under 'reparations.' It is no mere figure of speech to say that the Potsdam document implies that they are stripped to their very undergarments. All this is to be part of the 're-education' of the Germans into Democrats with abhorrence of dictatorship, love of liberty and appreciation of the ideal and principles of

western democracy, as exemplified before their eyes by the victors."

We have now completed this survey.

The three undercover forces for war, British World Empire, World Finance, and their constant companion, Organized World Jewry, are ubiquitous and their actions clothed in anonymity. But somewhere there are individuals who are the motivating forces in these activities. The affable Jew, active in business everywhere and the smiling companion of local groups taking time out for a mid-morning cup of coffee, is the only person remotely connected with any of these three great international institutions that the average American citizen ever meets in the flesh. He is disarming in his attitude which says in effect, "See, I am no different from you, am I?" Were he an individual he would be right. But he is not an individual. He does not stand alone and unsupported, as the great body of American citizenry must do. Actually, he is a watchman for the racial group into which he is born. By birth, by breeding and culture, he is a member of a great world-girdling super-organization, whose purpose it is to protect him in his desire to do as he chooses, and to promote the aspirations common to his racial group, without criticism or restraint from people who are forever barred by birth from the benefits of these great international protective associations. A New York City telephone book of any date will list between one and two columns of Jewish organizations and another half a column of Hebrew groups. Do not be misled that this is only in New York. Like a web, the threads of this protective fabric cover the whole land and spreads over beyond the seas. The individual American has so far been helpless before this organized super-state.

The late Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, American Zionist and adviser of Woodrow Wilson during his presidential years, lent his great abilities in the development of Jewish organization.

"Let us all recognize that we Jews are a distinct na-

tionality of which every Jew, whatever his country, his station or shade of belief, is necessarily a member," wrote Justice Brandeis in his book, THE JEWISH PROBLEM—HOW TO SOLVE IT. Here, with superb simplicity and directness, the late Supreme Court Justice gives us the source of the strength of Jewish organization—a common racial spirit. No one can quarrel with such a spirit when devoted to the development of a national culture. But unfortunately there are many who have been led to believe, that perhaps because of its internationalism, the Jewish spirit is antagonistic to other national cultures and tends to smother all but its own. Mr. Brandeis continues:

"Organize! Organize! Organize! Until every Jew in America must stand up and be counted — counted among us—or prove himself, wittingly or unwittingly, of the few who are against their own people."

There have been Jews who have sought to oppose this separateness, perhaps, in what has now been proven to be the vain hope of absorption. The Jews have generally opposed their disappearance by absorption and no racial group appears to have been able to accomplish it without a deterioration in its own stock and an abasement of its cultural spirit.

Rabbi Morris Lazaron addressing a Jewish meeting in St. Louis early in 1938, declared:

"There is no room in this country for any race, Italian, Russian, Polish or Jewish, to set itself up as a private community and build a wall around itself."

Promptly, Hungarian-born Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, ever on the alert, in his journal, Opinion, replied in the issue of March, 1938, with a scathing editorial entitled A JEWISH TRAITOR, from which we quote:

"The Jewish apostle of Christian-Jewish good-will stands exposed in the nakedness of his bitter and unyielding anti-Jewishness. If there were such a thing as a decent public opinion in America, Rabbi Morris La-

zaron of the Baltimore Hebrew Congregation would nevermore be permitted to stand before a Jewish meeting. Let him good-will all he chooses, but let him not stand up and pretend to be a Jew. He is a reviler of his people. He is a betrayer of its hopes. He is a destroyer of its ideals. One must needs pity a traitor, but the place of a Jewish traitor is not in the pulpit of a Jewish congregation."

The worthy Rabbi, evidently, is seeking to forestall any defection of the Jewish laity from the dominance of their "high priests." However, it is not likely that many Jews would want to forego the security and protection of their organizations in exchange for unorganized American individuality.

Rabbi Wise once startled the American people when he was reported as saying (late 1938) that he had been a Jew for six thousand years and an American for but sixty years. Steeped in six thousand years of Jewish experience and history he knows well what he is doing in attacking any suggestion of the dissolution of the Jewish community. From within this racial group, into which one must be born, Jewish ideas pour forth into the tolerant and unorganized Christian world, susceptible and naive, influencing the American people in their thoughts and in their deeds.

This is how it is done.

Commenting on the "educational" work of the Anti-Defamation League, its national director, Richard E. Gutstadt, stated:[1]

> I think the report submitted speaks for itself. The program of education which we have slowly and arduously developed, covers every media for improving the human mind. I say, without any desire to have it appear that the League is immodest, that in the several fields which have engaged the League's attention for enlightening the public mind, we have developed the outstanding agencies of America by general recognition. We have the greatest speakers bureau ever organized in this country, admittedly from the words of the leaders of the professional forums; we have the outstanding radio program in all the history of American radio—the transcription program I refer to. We have the most effective book placement bureau in the entire nation, and that is upon the authority of educators. Our fact-finding department's accomplishments are well known to you and need not be detailed.[2]

1. From A TRIAL ON TRIAL, page 63.

Nathan Ohrbach, National Chairman, Joint Appeal of the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, in a long letter of appeal asking for contributions to a $4,000,000.00 fund required to carry out a program for the "preservation of the Jewish Community," described the program as:

> ". . . a gigantic undertaking that requires facilities, strongly constructed, built up over a period of ten years of special techniques and experience in defense work. . . .
>
> "This is a high-powered educational program, geared to reach every man, woman and child; a program through the press; over the radio; through advertising; comic books; speakers; community service; movies; churches; labor; and special groups; a program that expands in accordance with expanded needs. . . .

(Evidently the needs have expanded—the Jewish Telegraph Agency reports a $6,000,000.00 budget for 1947, up 50 per cent from 1946.)

> "In the field of radio we have averaged more than 65,000 individual station broadcasts a year, averaging more than 216 individual station broadcasts a day. . . .
>
> "Our series of 26 full-page ads now running in 367 newspapers . . . representing a total dollar value of advertising space estimated at $691,520.00. This campaign is now appearing as a series of twelve posters on 1,000 billboards being displayed in 130 cities and val-

2. See Appendix X for the details.

ued at $250,000.00. It has been readapted on 16,000 car cards. . . .

"The general press—1,900 dailies with a 43,000,000 circulation—the rural press, the foreign language press, the Negro press, the labor press—with 10,000,000 readers—receive and use material from this division. . . .

"More than 330,000 copies of important books . . . were distributed to libraries" . . . and . . . "more than 9,000,000 pamphlets. . . .

"We presented the most noted names on the lecture platform to a total listening audience of more than 30,000,000 people (7,200 audiences reported—Ed.)

"We have received the cooperation of the leading comic publishers and comic book writers in the adaptation of our material, and have been successful in assisting in the production and distribution of millions of copies (40,000,000 reported—Ed.) . . .

"The Community Service Division consists of a central staff, over 150 public relations committees in as many cities, eleven regional offices, 2,000 key men in 1,000 cities. This division is a clearing house for information and service for the national organizations and community groups . . . maintaining constant contact between Jewish communities . . ." (complete report also published by Chicago Jewish Sentinel, September 5, 1945).

Upton Close, in his newsletter CLOSER-UPS of August 27, 1945, speaks of Nathan Ohrbach's tremendous program "as one no nation worthy of the name could allow to be prosecuted within its body without understanding more about it. You can well see what a diabolical tool it could make for any political ism or power group. There is nothing so beautiful to cloak politics in, as religious tolerance."

CHAPTER SEVEN

Conclusions

"We fought the war of 1776 for independence. We fought the Civil War to free the slaves. We fought the War of 1918 to make the world safe for democracy. We fought this war to lose everything we had gained from the other three." (The late General George Patton, quoted from speech before the Senate, by the Hon. William Langer, Senator from North Dakota, April 18, 1946.)

The material assembled between these covers is available to anyone who will look for it, but it will take a great deal of looking. The English source books, which had no American editions, are collectors' items. The American source books occasionally turn up on the used book stalls, but so infrequently that a constant watch must be kept. Douglas Reed, British author of INSANITY FAIR and DISGRACE ABOUNDING, has written of his experience with American publishers (see page 40).

What of the newspapers—the great circulation press of America?

John Swinton, an editor of note, before the war of 1914, at an annual dinner of the American Press Association, passed judgment on the New York press as follows:

"There is no such thing as an independent press in America, if we except that of little country towns. You know this and I know it. Not a man among you dares to utter his honest opinion. Were you to utter it, you know beforehand that it would never appear in print. I am paid one hundred and fifty dollars a week so that I may keep my honest opinion out of the newspaper for which I write. You too are paid similar salaries for similar servies. Were I to permit that a single edition of my newspaper contained an honest opinion, my occupation—like Othello's—would be gone in less than

twenty-four hours. The man who would be so foolish as to write his honest opinion would soon be on the streets in search of another job. It is the duty of a New York journalist to lie, to distort, to revile, to toady at the feet of Mammon, and to sell his country and his race for his daily bread, or what amounts to the same thing, his salary. We are the tools and the vassals of the rich behind the scenes. We are marionettes. These men pull the strings and we dance. Our time, our talents, our lives, our capacities are all the property of these men—we are intellectual prostitutes." (As quoted by T. St. John Gaffney in BREAKING THE SILENCE, page 4.)

That was the circulation press of New York City before 1914.

It is the circulation press of America today.

Americans view the passing scene through the eyes, so to speak, of the great international influences shaping the destiny of the world. Wearied by the intense struggle to make a living, they are soothed into comfortable mental lethargy by the triple daily anodynes; the radio, the newspaper, and the cinema. In the nobility of their tolerance, they have allowed themselves to be educated into ignorance of what actually is going on in the world. They have had their sensibilities so dulled that they have not been able to realize that they and their country are pawns of the UNDER COVER FORCES FOR WAR.

APPENDIX I

President Lincoln and The International Bankers Of His Day

During the American Civil War there was much international financial intriguing,* that is certain. The facts are concealed. They are never written of. So strong is the influence of "make-believe"—to make believe that something did not or does not exist because it is unpalatable to powerful groups—that up to now these facts are not admitted to have attained respectability in orthodox writings. La Vieille France published in March, 1921 (No. 216) an article by Conrad Siem giving an account of a conversation with Bismarck in 1876:

"It is not to be doubted, I know of absolute certainty," Bismarck declared, "that the division of the United States into two federations of equal power had been decided upon well in advance of the Civil War by the top financial power of Europe (la Haute Finance). These bankers were afraid that the United States, if they were to remain entirely one and were to develop into one Nation only, would achieve economic and financial independence, and this latter would completely upset the capitalist domination of Europe over the world.

"Of course, within the 'inner circle' of Finance, the voice of Rothschild dominated. They foresaw the chance of prodigious booty if they could substitute two weak democracies, burdened with debt, imploring the aid of the Jewish financiers, in place of the vigorous Republic, confident and proud, sufficient unto herself. Consequently they put their emissaries in the field to exploit the question of slavery, to open up an abyss between the two sections of the Union.

"Abraham Lincoln, of course, had never suspected

1. See STATESMEN OF A LOST CAUSE, Burton J. Hendrick; MONEY CREATORS, Gertrude Coogan, Sound Money Press, Chicago, Ill.; THIS ONE MAD ACT, Izola Forrestor (Cushman & Flint, 1937); THE MAD BOOTHS OF MARYLAND (Bobbs-Merrill, 1940).

these undercover manoeuvres. He had always been anti-slavery; he was elected as such; but his very character made it impossible for him to be a man of (only) one party once he was in power. When he got control, he saw clearly that the sinister financiers of Europe wanted to make him the tool of their designs.

"The rupture between the North and South became inevitable; the masters of European finance employed all their forces to bring it about and to turn it to their own account. Lincoln's personality surprised them. His candidacy had caused them no alarm; on the contrary, they had counted on easily duping the gullible backwoodsman. However, Lincoln saw through their game, and he understood that the worst enemy was not the South, but the Jewish capitalism of Europe. He confided his fears in no one; he thought carefully, he watched for the signs of the Hidden Hand; he did not want to publicly expose questions that would have disturbed the unknowing masses of the people; he decided alone to eliminate International Finance by setting up a system of loans that permitted the State to have the people (themselves) as loaners without intermediary. He had not studied questions of finance, but his great common sense told him that the source of all wealth rested in the labor and in the economy of the Nation. He opposed issues of paper negotiated by International Finance; he got from Congress the authority to lend directly to the people by selling them bonds of the State. The banks of the country were overjoyed to lend their approval to this system. The government and the Nation escaped the machinations of international finance. It then became a question of sticking to it until final victory of the North.

"In proclaiming, in one of his early messages, that 'Capital is solely the fruit of labor,' Lincoln had no thought of launching a socialist smoke-screen (*boniment*); he simply made it known to the world that the United States had no need of alien capital in order to develop her resources; and this declaration of

principle went hand in hand, in his own mind, with a concrete plan of economic organization.

"The 'inner circle' of International Finance (then) knew that the immense field, immensely rich, of the United States, was to be taken out of their control. The death of Lincoln was decided upon. Nothing was simpler than to find a dupe to strike the fatal blow."

And Bismarck continued:

"The death of Lincoln has been the very greatest disaster for Christendom. There was no one in the United States of sufficient stature to fill his shoes. Now Israel has again begun their mad scramble for gold in the new world. I am fearful that the Jewish bank, with all its guile and torturous methods, may entirely control the exuberant wealth of America and use it to systematically corrupt modern civilization. The Jews will not hesitate to plunge all of Christendom into wars and chaos to the end that 'the earth shall be the inheritance of Israel.' "

La Vielle France was the paper of M. Urbain Gohier, sixty or more year old Frenchman in 1921. At that time he could be seen working strenuously in his Paris office at 5 Rue Pre-aux Clercs, against those anonymous forces that for many years had worked to undermine the governments of Europe.* These forces owe their triumph, in a large measure, to the perversion of the American mind to take delight in sacrificing hundreds of thousands of the Nation's sons and billions of its wealth for the UNDER COVER FORCES FOR WAR.

APPENDIX II

British Concentration Camps In The Boer War

No doubt the vividness of the picture left on the horizon, "when the sun disappeared on the last day of the

2. See MARXISM & JUDAISM, by Salluste, Examiner Books, New York).

nineteenth centry," blinded Mr. Dos Passos' vision to the sufferings British imperialism was then imposing on the Boer people. I cite from an official report addressed to President Kruger by the Boer General Jan C. Smuts:

"'Lord Kitchener began to carry out in the two republics a policy distinguished by unheard of barbarity and by disregard of the elemental principles of all martial law. As a result, in the winter of 1901, our poor country and people were precipitated into a condition of devastation and misery which beggars description. Nearly all the farms and villages in the two republics were devastated and burnt to the ground; all the corn was destroyed; all the cattle that had fallen into the enemy's hands killed or rather ruthlessly butchered. The great majority of our women and children ate their bread in tears in the enemy's concentration camps and those still at liberty roamed about the bush and the mountains among Kaffirs and wild beasts. The "veldt" was set on fire in both republics by the enemy; as far as one could see everything was black.

"'One of the questionable fighting methods the enemy employs against us is his mendacity. That is to say, not only his lying proclamations and announcements whereby he incessantly endeavored to confuse our people and lead them astray from their duty, but also the reports which were circulated officially as well as unofficially throughout the whole world by the British press. In these everything is distorted—the entire war situation is represented in a manner calculated to give the world, and the British people in particular, an impression exactly opposite to the truth. . . . However, I am loath to dwell further on this pest of mendacity which poisons the entire British military world.'

"General Smuts then protests against the 'torturing, imprisoning and ill treating of women.' (It will be remembered that over 22,000 Boer women and children died in English prison camps.) Farther on General Smuts denounces 'the arming and recruiting of the colored tribes'; thousands of Kaffirs being induced by fear or avarice to join the British forces. (In this, England followed her traditional policy as she did in employing the Indians (American—Ed.) to murder and scalp revolutionary soldiers.) General Smuts also denounced 'the awful mutilation of Boer soldiers found on the battlefield.' He concludes:

"'The war has long since degenerated into an enterprise for the extermination of the Boer people. Day by day we learn of atrocities, all of which but form a commentary to the memorable words of the English High Commissioner himself that Afrikanders must be exterminated.'" (Breaking The Silence, pp. 61-62, T. St. John Gaffney.)

Africa Delenda Est.

APPENDIX III

The War In South Africa

Mr. J. A. Hobson, in his book THE WAR IN SOUTH AFRICA (Macmillan 1900), describes how a non-British group of international financiers used British imperialism to dominate the economic and political life of South Africa. He reveals the sordid details which orthodox writers and historians eulogized for popular consumption. Mr. Hobson is quoted at considerable length because the UNDER COVER FORCES FOR WAR are shown in full operation.

There will be no difficulty in drawing parallels between the war in South Africa and, the First World War; the Spanish Civil War; and finally the Second World War still running its course in the Freedom to Plunder, the Freedom to Enslave, the Freedom to Murder, and, most appallingly, the Freedom to Rape the defenseless women and girls of Europe.

For Whom Are We Fighting?

"A few of the financial pioneers in South Africa have been Englishmen, like Messrs. Rhodes and Rudd; but recent developments of Transvaal gold-mining have

thrown the economic resources of the country more and more into the hands of a small group of international financiers, chiefly German in origin and Jewish in race. By superior ability, enterprise, and *organization* (italis ours—Ed.), these men, out-competing the slower-witted Briton have attained a practical supremacy no one who has visited Johannesburg is likely to question.

"It should be distinctly understood that the stress which my analysis lays upon the Jew has reference to the class of financial capitalists of which the foreign Jew must be taken as the leading type.

"Before I went there, the names of Beit, Ekstein, Barnato, etc., were of course not unknown to me; the very ship in which I crossed bore many scores of Jewish women and children. But until I came to examine closely the structure of industry and society upon the Rand I had no conception of their number or their power. I thus discovered that not Hamburg, not Vienna, not Frankfort, but Johannesburg is the New Jerusalem. . . .

"It is not too much to say that this little ring of international financiers already controls the most valuable economic resources of the Transvaal (pp. 189-191).

". . . . a little reflection shows that while this class of financiers has commonly abstained in other countries from active participation in politics, they will use politics in the Transvaal. They have found the need for controlling politics and legislation by bribery and other persuasive arts hitherto: the same need and use will exist in the future. Politics to them will not merely mean free trade and good administration of just laws. Transvaal industry, particularly the mining industry, requires the constant and important aid of the State. The control of a large, cheap, regular, submissive supply of labour, the chief corner-stone of profitable business, will be a constant incentive to acquire

political control: railway rates, customs laws, and the all-important issues relating to mineral rights, will force them into politics, and they will apply to these the same qualities which have made them so successful in speculative industry. In a word, they will simply and inevitably add to their other businesses the business of politics. The particular form of government which may be adopted will not matter very much. Government from Downing Street may perhaps hamper them a little more than the forms of popular representative government; but judicious control of the press and the assistance of financial friends in high places will enable them to establish and maintain a tolerably complete form of boss-rule in South Africa.

". . . We are fighting in order to place a small international oligarchy of mine-owners and speculators in power at Pretoria. Englishmen will surely do well to recognize that the economic and political destinies of South Africa are, and seem likely to remain, in the hands of men most of whom are foreigners by origin, whose trade is finance, and whose trade interests are not chiefly British." (Pages 196-197.)

A Chartered Press

"When the capitalists of the Rand had determined upon a *coup,* and possessed the full assurance that the British Government was behind them, they redoubled their efforts to precipitate a crisis. For this purpose notable changes were made in the press of Johannesburg." (Page 208.)

". . . The chief object of this press conspiracy, to attain which every nerve was strained, was the conquest of the Government and the conscience of Great Britain. I have no hesitation in saying that a large proportion of the outrages and other sensations emanating from the press of Johannesburg and Cape Town were designed chiefly, if not exclusively, for the British market." (Page 215.)

"What I am describing is nothing else than an elaborate factory of misrepresentations for the purpose of

stimulating British action. To those unacquainted with the mechanism it may seem incredible that with modern means of communication it has been possible to poison the conscience and intelligence of England. But when it is understood that the great London press receives its information almost exclusively from the offices of the kept press of South Africa, the mystery is solved." (Page 216.)

"When it is borne in mind that this great confederation of press interests is financially cemented by the fact that Rand mining magnates are chief owners of at least two important London daily papers and of several considerable weekly papers, while the wider and ever-growing Jewish control of other organs of the press warrants a suspicion that the direct economic nexue between the English press and Rand finance is far stronger than is actually known, we shall have a clear comprehension of the press conspiracy which has successfully exploited the stupid Jingoism of the British public or its clearly conceived economic ends." (P. 217.)

"One last link in the chain deserves notice. It was necessary not only to deceive the British public as to the true position in South Africa, but also to deceive South Africa as to the state of feeling in Great Britain. I need not describe in detail how this was done; how intelligence from Europe was selected, distorted, heightened or suppressed, in order to support the agitation among the British Colonists and Outlanders, and to goad on the Governments and the Republices towards the precipice of war. The virtual unanimity of all parties in England, with the exception of a mere despicable handful of Little Englanders, the support of the entire British press, the endorsement of a drastic policy by European Governments—these points were enforced by every art of the *suppressio veri** and the *suggesto falsi.*" (Pages 227-228.)

*Interestingly The Weekly Review (London), the journal of "The Little Englanders," published a pamphlet on the falsity of press reporting during the Spanish Civil War, entitled SUPRESSIO VERI, by Vincent Wright.

APPENDIX IV

Democracy and Social Instability

J. Middleton Murry, an English author of note, in his book, BETRAYAL OF CHRIST BY THE CHURCHES, supplies us with a realistic study of what has actually happened (page 182):

We are horrified at the turn world-history has taken; but we ourselves are largely responsible for it. The new and sinister combination between nationalism and industrialism is, to a large extent, a reaction to the behavior of nineteenth century Britain. Wealth then poured into this country as the result of our pioneering in machine-manufacture. That influx of wealth was so great that it reconciled us to the entire dislocation of our national economy, and the terrible proliferation of urban industrial squalor at the cost of agricultural and handicraft decay. By the accepted standards of British society, the wealth which we acquired was ample compensation for the ruin of a natural and balanced economy. But our export of cheap manufactures shattered the traditional economy of the nations or the peoples who bought from us. The hand-weaver of Austria, or India, found himself ruined by our cheap textiles. And for these ruined national economies there was no compensation in any new accession of wealth. Inevitably the reaction was nationalistic. The nations protected themselves by tariffs, and proceeded to industrialize themselves at their own pace, and in their own interests.

Of all self-righteous illusions the British tradition of the virtue of free trade is one of the most pathetic. Free trade, as we practiced it, was a shocking violation of true international morality; yet for generations of Britons it was itself the perfection of international morality. The tradition is so strong that we will tend to regard the determination of other nations to make themselves self-sufficient as retrograde and immoral. It might be retrograde in respect of a just or fraternal world-economy, in which nations supplied one another's

deficiences without seeking profit on the transaction; but in respect of world free trade as practiced by Britain it is a positive advance. The determination to keep the shaping of natural economy in the hands of the nation, and not to expose it to the disruptive and irresponsible influences of world trade and international finance, is in itself entirely laudable. It makes for the stability of society, as against the inherent instability created by a capitalist and free-trade economy.

By the standards of free-trade capitalism social instability is a virtue, though it goes by another name. It is called the free flow of labour. But this freely flowing labour, in human terms, is the incessant uprooting of human beings from their environment at the fiat of some enterprising and irresponsible profit-seeker. How many men in this country are living in the parishes in which their grandfathers were born? Almost certainly not more than a few hundred thousand; probably not more than one-fiftieth or one-hundredth of the whole population. The consequence is that the great majority of the British people have no stable ways of life, no local memories, no natural piety. They lack a center of gravity; they are at the mercy of cosmopolitan sensationalism, naked to the essentially homeless and irresponsible influences of the cinema, the circula-
their food now comes to them in tins, or from the fried-fish pantechicon. They have lost what the sociologist calls their folk-ways.

It is against this fearful uprooting that totalitarian nationalism and self-suffiicency is a protest. It is an attempt to recreate social stability by authoritarian control of the national life. Unless we understand it as an effort to remedy a disease so deep-rooted in our own country that we are hardly conscious of its existence, we live in a world of illusion. While we live in that world of illusion the danger is great that we shall discover that totalitarianism is stronger, not only materially, but morally, than what we call democracy. For behind our facade of democracy the development of

social instability has gone on unchecked for generations. If democracy is, as it should be, a political system which recognizes the right of the individual person to the fullest and freest development compatible with the harmonious development of society as a whole, our democracy is hardly more than a caricuture of true democracy. It produces millions of uprooted and unstable persons and confers upon them the right to decide upon issues they cannot comprehend. And even the tiny minority which appreciates, for the right reason, our tradition of freedom of speech and expression might well be visited by profound misgiving if it were to ask itself the question: "Would it not be better for society as a whole if we were to surrender our right to free expression, provided that the wholesale debauching of the people by the circulation press and the cinema were brought to and end?" (End of quote)

APPENDIX V

Winston Churchill In India

Air Marshal Tedder made every effort to be a worthy pupil of his superior, former Prime Minister Churchill. In his book A ROVING COMMISSION, Churchill writes about India:

> "Sir Bindon (Blood) sent orders that we were to stay in Mamund Valley (India) and lay it waste with fire and sword in vengeance. This accordingly we did with great precautions. We proceeded systematically, village by village, and we destroyed the houses, filled up the wells, blew down the towers, cut down the great shady trees, burned the crops and broke the reservoirs in punitive devastation." (Page 147.)

APPENDIX VI

Winston Churchill On War

Many quotations on methods of warfare from the writings of Clausewitz, Trietschke, von Bernhardi and

Banse have been widely publicized. To these should be added one from the writings of Winston Churchill:

"It was not until the dawn of the twentieth century of the Christian era that war really began to enter into its kingdom as the potential destroyer of the human race. . . .

"The press affords a means of unification and of mutual encouragement; Religion having discreetly avoided conflict on the fundamental issues, offered its encouragements and consolations . . . impartially to all combatants . . .

"Instead of merely starving fortified towns, whole nations were to be methodically subjected . . . to the process of reduction by famine* . . . The air opened paths along which death and terror could be carried far behind the lines of the actual armies, to women, children, the aged, the sick, who in earlier struggles would perforce have been left untouched. . . .

"But all that happened in the four years of the Great War was only a prelude to what was preparing for the fifth year. The campaign of the year 1919 would have witnessed an immense accession to the power of destruction. Had the Germans retained the morale to make good their retreat to the Rhine, they would have been assaulted in the summer of 1919 with forces and by methods incomparably more prodigious than any yet employed. Thousands of aeroplanes would have shattered their cities. Scores of thousands of cannon would have blasted their front. Arrangements were being made to carry simultaneously a quarter of a million men, together with all their requirements, continuously forward across country in mechanical vehicles. . . . Poison gas of incredible malignity, against which only a secret mask (which the Germans could not obtain in time) was proof, would have stifled all resistance and

*British 1918-1919 blockade of Germany—see UNFINISHED VICTORY, by Arthur Bryant. 1945-1946 American Morgenthau Plan for Germany—see AMERICA'S CHOICE: PEACE OR MORGENTHAU PLAN, Senator William Langer, United States Senate, April 18, 1946.

paralyzed all life on the hostile front . . . The signal of relief was given, and the horrors of 1919 remained buried in the archives of the great antagonists. . . .

"The campaign of 1919 was never fought; but its ideas go marching along. In every army they are being explored, elaborated, refined under the surface of peace, and should war come again to the world it is not with the weapons and agencies prepared for 1919 that it will be fought, but with the developments and extensions of these which will be incomparably more formidable and fatal . . ." (The Great War, Vol. 3, Page 1602, Library of Congress 521.C497.)

APPENDIX VII

Walter Rathenau Predicted Germany Today

Walter Rathenau wrote many letters bearing on the events of his time, contributed numerous articles to newspapers, and was the author of several books. From WALTER RATHENAU, HIS LIFE AND WORK, by Count Harry Kessler, we quote the following:

"'Three hundred men, all acquainted with each other,' wrote Rathenau in 1909 in the Christmas number of the Neue Freie Press, 'control the economic destiny of the Continent.' He himself was one of the three hundred. He was associated at that time with eighty-four large concerns, either as a member of the supervising board or as a managing director." (Page 121.)

"In December, 1918, he wrote two open letters, one 'To all who are not blinded by hate' and the other to President Wilson's friend, Colonel House. 'He who visits Germany twenty years hence,' he said in the first, 'Germany which he had known as one Earth's fairest lands, will feel his heart sinking in grief and shame . . . The German cities will not be precisely ruins; they will be half-dead blocks of stone, still partly tenanted by

wretched, careworn beings . . . The country will be trodden under foot, the woods hewn down, the fields scarce showing their miserable crops; harbors, railways, canals, will be in ruin and decay, and everywhere will stand the mighty buildings of the past, crumbling reminders of the age of greatness . . . The German spirit which has sung and thought for the world will be a thing of the past, and a people still young and strong today, and created by God for life, will exist only in a state of living death.'" (Page 273.)

"To President Wilson's friend he wrote: 'Never since history began has so much power been entrusted to any one body of men as to Wilson, Clemenceau, and Lloyd-George today. Never before has the fate of a healthy, unbroken, gifted and industrious people been dependent on one single decision of a group of men. Suppose that a hundred years hence the thriving towns of Germany are deserted and in ruins, its trade and industry destroyed, the German spirit in science and art dead, and German men and women in their millions torn and driven from their homes—will the verdict of history and of God then be that this people have been treated justly, and that the three men responsible for this devastation have done justice-'" (Page 273.)

APPENDIX VIII

Austria Before Hitler

The Schnere Zukunft, Catholic Weekly of Vienna, edited by Dr. Joseph Eberle, enjoying a standing in journalism in Austria similar to that enjoyed by the London Tablet in England, printed the following article by Dr. Eberle, on November 13, 1932:

"Today Catholics are almost completely silent about the question of Judaism, though Jewish influence, not only in Russia, Hungary, Poland, France, England, America and Austria but also in Germany has attained a degree of power and might altogether out of proportion to the number of Jews in the total population of these countries. Three-fourths of the large banking concerns, at the head of which we must place the four big D-Banks—Deutsche Bank, Darmstadter Bank, Diskonto-Gesellschaft and Dresdener Bank—three-fourths of the big exchanges, including those of Berlin, Frankfort, and Hamburg, three-fourths of the principal commercial enterprises, including those of Karstadt, Tietz and Wertheim, three-fourths of the leading newspapers, of the publishing firms, of the telegraphic and advertising agencies, of groups controlling theatres and cinemas, are Jewish. In Austria, matters are still worse. Of course, there are still many non-Jewish industrial magnates, but they are becoming more and more subservient to banks directed by Jews. There are certainly still to be found rich landed proprietors and wealthy financiers who are Christians, but so far as the direction of economic affairs is concerned, they are without influence, in comparison with Jewish financial magnates, such as Charles Furstenberg, Dr. Solmssen, Mammroth, Bleichroder, Speyer-Ellissen, Soberheim, Landau, Arnhold, Dr. Solamonsohn, Eugen, Gutman, von Straus, Kempner, Freiherr von Oppenheim, Warburg, etc. There are still influential Catholic publishing firms, but even firms like those of Herder and Kosel-Pustet are much inferior to the Jewish publishing firms of Ullstein, Mosse, Cassirer, E. Goldschmidt, etc. There are certainly many non-Jewish writers, nevertheless we learn from statistics of the publishing business that, in Germany, foreign and Jewish authors are more widely read than German and Christian authors, so that Borries von Munchhausen speaks of the passing of the German soul. It can be established also that the best known non-Jewish men of letters, as for example, Gerhart Hauptmann and Sudermann, owe their literary success to their friendliness toward Judaism. Such are the intellectual and economic power and influence of the Jews in Germany today. And yet Catholics in great measure keep silence about the matter. The silence is, in part, due to ignorance, especially in the

provinces. But it is also due to an already existing dependence on Jews. Three-fourths of the Christian newspapers would be reduced to two-thirds or even one-half their present size, if they were compelled to give up the advertisements of Jewish shops and banks, and Jewish advertisements would not be forthcoming if the Jewish question were treated of." (MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST IN THE MODERN WORLD, by Rev. Denis Fahey, page 310.)

APPENDIX IX

Danzig And The Corridor

GERMANY UNDER THE TREATY, William Harbut Dawson (English authority on Germany):

". . . No factor in the life of Europe today offers so grave and certain a menace to peace than the Corridor, which cuts Germany into two parts, and severs Danzig, one of the most German of cities, from the Fatherland. Can Europe afford to ignore this menace and allow matters to drift? So to do would be tantamount to inviting and hastening catastrophe, for instead of improving, the conditions in the Corridor, after and because of over twelve years of Polish occupation, are steadily growing worse.

"Because it is now abundantly clear that all the needs of Polish trade, present and future, can be satisfied without the Corridor, and because good relations between Germany and Poland, which are so essential to the settlement and peace of Europe, will be impossible so long as that political montrosity continues, the greater part of the territory should go back to the country to which it owes its civilization." (Pages 169-170.)

APPENDIX X

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

Maximillian J. St. George and Lawrence Dennis, authors of a TRIAL ON TRIAL, write of the Anti-Defamation League as follows (pages 62-63):

The Anti-Defamation League increased their expenditures from $125,000.00 a year for three preceding years to $800,000.00 for the year 1941.

This minority pressure group to get America into the war and to persecute those who opposed such a policy for this country described its activities in the following terms:

"We commend the work of the League in furnishing information to newspapers, magazines, and other agencies concerning our problems, and we urge the continuance of this project. We also look with favor on the work of the League in indexing, tabulating, and getting biographical data on individuals and organizations carrying on subversive activities in this country. Such information has been of great value not only to the League but likewise to the constituted authorities in carrying on their work. It seems almost incredible that an organization the size of the League could have tabulated, indexed and obtained information on the 50,000 persons and organizations which are now catalogued in its files."

This minority pressure group not only maintained its own secret police and spy service, to aid the authorities, of course, in suppressing subversive elements, that is to say, those who opposed American entry into the war and who criticized Jews, but it went in heavily for propaganda.

APPENDIX XI

Theodor Herzl Confutes Nathan Ohrbach

Theodor Herzl, the great protagonist of Zionism, differing with Nathan Ohrbach, states that the problem has little to do with religion. It is economic. Herzl writes in

his book, THE JEWISH STATE, as follows:

"We shall not again touch on those causes which are the result of temperament, prejudice and narrow views, but shall restrict ourselves to political and economic causes alone. Modern Anti-Semitism is not to be confounded with religious persecution of the Jews of former times. It does occasionally take a religious bias in some countries, but the main current of the aggresive movement has now changed. In the principal countries where Anti-Semitism prevails, it does so as a result of the emancipation of the Jews. When civilized nations awoke to the inhumanity of discriminatory legislation and enfranchised us, our enfranchisement came too late. It was no longer possible legally to remove our disabilities in our old homes. For we had, curiously enough, developed while in the Ghetto into a bourgeois people, and we stepped out of it only to enter into the fierce competition with the middle class circle, where we have a double pressure to sustain, from within and from without. The Christian bourgeois would not be willing to cast us as a sacrifice to Socialism, though that would not greatly improve matters. . . . The very impossibility of getting at the Jews nourishes and embitters hatred of them. Anti-Semitism increases day by day and hour by hour among the nations; indeed, it is bound to increase, because the causes of its growth continue to exist and cannot be removed. Its remote cause is our loss of power of assimilation during the Middle Ages; its immediate cause is our excessive production of mediocre intellects, who cannot find an outlet downwards or upwards—that is to say, no wholesome outlet in either direction. When we sink, we become a revolutionary proletariat, the subordinate officers of all revolutionary parties; at the same time, when we rise, there also rises our terrible power of the purse." (Pages 25-26.)

Bibliography

Bartlett, Ellis Ashmead—Tragedy of Central Europe, Thorton Butterworth, 1923.

Belloc, Hilaire—Monarchy, A Study of Louis XIV, Constable, London, 1939.

Can We Rope In America? Weekly Review, Jan. 8, 1938.

Bemis, Samuel Flagg—Diplomatic History of the United States, H. Holt, 1936.

Brandeis, Justice Louis D.—The Jewish Problem—How to Solve It, Federation of American Zionists, 1917.

Broad, Lewis—The Way of The Dictators, Hutchinson, 1935.

Brooks, Collin—Can Chamberlain Save Great Britain, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1938.

Bryant, Arthur—Unfinished Victory, Macmillan, London, 1940.

Carnegie, Andrew—Triumphant Democracy, Scribner's (1893 edition).

Carrere, Jean—L'Imperialism Brittainque, Perrin & Cie, 1917.

Carter, Boake—Why Meddle in the Orient, Dodge, 1938.

Chamberlain, Sir Austin, Down The Years, Cassell, 1935.

Churchill, Winston—A Roving Commission, Thornton Butterworth, 1930.

The Great War, Newness, 1933.

Conklin, Viola—American Political History, H. Holt, 1901.

Coogan, Gertrude—Money Creators, Sound Money Press, Chicago.

Dawson, W. H.—Germany Under the Treaty, Allen & Unwin, 1933.

Dennis, Lawrence—A Trial on Trial, with Maximiliam J. St. George, National Civil Rights Committee.

Denny, Ludwell—America Conquers Britain, Knopf, 1930.

Dillon, Dr. Edward J.—Inside Story of the Peace Conference, Harpers, 1920.

Disraeli, Benjamin—Coningsby, 1844.

Dos Passos, John R.—The Anglo-American Century, Putnam, 1903.

Economist (London)

Forrestor, Izola—This One Mad Act, Cushman & Flint, 1937.

Fullerton, J. Morton—Problems of Power, Constable, London, 1913.

Gaffney, T. St. John—Breaking The Silence, Horace Liveright, 1931.

Garrett, Garet—The Bubble That Broke The World, Bobbs-Merrill, 1933.

The Revolution Was, Caxton Press, 1945.

Hendrick, Burton J.—Statesmen of a Lost Cause, Little Brown, 1939.

Herring, Hubert—And So to War, Yale University Press, 1938.

Herzl, Theodore—Jewish State 1896.

Hobson, J. A.—The War In South Africa, Macmillan, London, 1900.

Holt, John B.—Under The Swastika, University of N. C. Press, 1936.

House, Col. E. M.—Intimate Papers of Col. House, Houghton Mifflin, 1926.

Howe, Quincy—England Expects Every American to Do His Duty, Simon & Schuster, 1937.

Huddleston, Sisley—War Unless, Lippincott, 1934.

Johnson, Walter—Battle Against Isolation, Univ. Chicago Press, 1944.
Kessler, Count—Walter Rathenau, Gerald Howe, London, 1929.
Kimmel, Stanley—The Mad Booths of Maryland, Bobbs-Merrill, 1940.
Korostovetz, Vladimir—Europe In the Melting Pot, Hutchinson, London, 1938.
Landman, Samuel—Great Britain, The Jews and Palestine, New Zionist Publications, London, 1936.
Lansing, Robert—Peace Negotiations, Houghton-Mifflin, 1921.
Lloyd-George, David—Memoirs of The Peace Conference, Yale Univ. Press, 1938.

The Truth About The Peace Treaties.

Mark, Geoffrey—Modern Idolatry, Chatto Windus, 1934.
Miller, Charles Grant—Poisoned Loving Cup, Natl. Hist. Society, 1938.
Morel, E. D.—The Secret History of a Great Betrayal, Foreign Affairs, London.
Murry, J. Middleton—Betrayal of Christ by the Churches, Andrew Dakers, London, 1940.
Nevins, Allen—Henry White, Thirty Years of American Diplomacy, Harpers, 1930.
Nichols, Beverly—News of England, Jonathon Cape, 1938.
Nicholson, Harold—Portrait of a Diplomatist, Houghton-Mifflin, 1930.
Orton, William—Twenty Years' Armistice, 1918-1938, Farrar & Rhinehart, 1938.
Page, Kirby—National Defense, Farrar & Rhinehart, 1938.
Playne, C. E.—Neurosis of Nations, Seltzer, 1925.
Potocki, Jerzy—Polish Documents
Pratt, Fletcher—U. S. A.: The Aggressor Nation, Amer. Mercury, Dec., 1938.
Radziwill, Princess—Quarante-cinq de Ma Vie, 1770-1815.
Reed, Douglas—Disgrace Abounding, Jonathon Cape, London, 1938.
Rogerson, Sidney—Propaganda In the Next War, Bles, 1939.
Russell, Leonard—The Way of the Dictators, 1935.
St. George, Maximilian J.—A Trial on Trial, Natl. Civil Rights Com.
Sarpedon—England's Service, Macmillan, 1940.
Schoonmaker, Edwin D.—Democracy and World Dominion, Richard Smith, 1939.
Scrutton, Robert J.—A People's Runnymede, Andrew Dakers London, London, 1939.
De Siebert—Entente Diplomacy, Scribner's, 1923.
Snow, John Howland—America, Which Way?; The Case of Tyler Kent, Domestic and Foreign Affairs.
Sombart, Werner—A New Social Philosophy, Princeton Univ. Press, 1937.
Tansill, Charles C.—America Goes To War, Little, Brown, 1938.
Utley, Freda—The Dream We Lost, John Day, 1940.
Wheeler-Bennet, J. W.—Information on Reduction of Armaments.
William, Basil—Cecil Rhodes, Constable, 1921.
Wise, Jennings C.—Woodrow Wilson, Disciple of Revolution, Paisley, 1937.

Index

A

America and World War I:
Churchill Indicts America 16
Entry Decisive 17
See Jewish Influences
Balfour Declaration
Anglo-American League 2
Anglo-Saxon People
Jewish Influence 25, 26
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith activities
Opposed U. S. Neutrality 63
Secret police and spy service 107
Anti-Semitism and
American Neutrality 68
Theodore Herzl 108
World War II 73
Armistice 1918 28
Ashmead-Bartlett, Ellis 36
Atlantic Charter 69
Austria Before Hitler 104
Austria Wanted Hitler 40
Austria and the Jews 36

B

Balfour Declaration 20
Balance of Power Policy 8, 76
Balfour, Arthur
War Against Germany 12
Barnes, Harry Elmer
British starvation blockade 29
Baruch, Bernard,
and Americanism 55
Hitler and war with Germany 74
Supported Woodrow Wilson 18
Belloc, Hilaire
"Roping in America" 58
The Money Powers 2
Bemis, Samuel F.
Greatest Mistake of American diplomacy 5
Benckendorff 8, 11
Ben-Gurion, David
Britain's war Zionists' war 73
Bismarck 9, 91
B'nai B'rith
See Anti-Defamation League
Bonaparte, Napoleon 8, 35
Boston and Danzig 45
Brandeis, Justice Louis D.
Influenced Woodrow Wilson 19
Jewish organization 84
British-American Union
Andrew Carnegie 1
Cecil Rhodes 6
British Propaganda
World War I 15
British Starvation Blockade of Germany (1919) 29, 31
Broad, Lewis 30
Brooks, Collin 30
Broun, Heywood 52
Bryan, William Jennings 18
Bryant, Arthur
Peace Treaty (1919) 35, 36
Bullitt, Wm. Christian, and Robt. Lansing on the Treaty 22
Polish documents 50
War In Europe Decided Upon 57

C

Cambon 11
Carnegie, Andrew 6
Carnock, Lord,
and the Treaty of Versailles 33
Carrere, Jean; Boer War 4
Carter, Boake 5
Catholic Church,
and Jewish influence 63, 104
Chamberlain, Sir Austin
Polish Corridor 46
Chamberlain, Joseph 57
Chamberlain, Neville 51
Churchill, Winston
Atlantic Charter 69
Cables to Roosevelt 57
Smash Germany 67
Step by Step Speech 46
Worked to Involve U. S. 72
Zurich Speech 67
Clemenceau 33
Cless, Geo., Jr., Wm. Allen White Reign of Terror 49
Close, Upton,
on Anti-Defamation League's propaganda 88
Commintern propaganda,
Nation and New Republic 51-2
American Press 52

D

Danzig 45, 106
Democracy, Peace 24
Wealth 27
Social Instability 99
Dillon, Dr. Edward J 24
Dos Passos, John R. 3

E

Eastland, Sen. James O.
Stuttgart rapings ... 10
Edcn, Anthony
Barter and Money Payments ... 77
Elkis, Abram and Wilson ... 18
English speaking peoples, alliance of, leads to war ... 2, 4
Jewish influence ... 26

F

Fight For Freedom ... 66
Fischer, Louis ... 52
Fish, Hamilton, on Pearl Harbor, and Henry L. Stimson ... 70
Frankfurter, Felix ... 55
Fullerton, Wm. Morton ... 2, 27
Funk, Walter ... 56

G

Gaffney, T. St. John ... 13, 15, 95
Garrett, Garet ... 17
Germany
Aggression against by Great Powers ... 3, 11
Reaction against ... 34-5
Antagonistic public opinion in America ... 52, 54
Armistice (1918) ... 29, 30
Army, for protection ... 10
Compared with British Navy by Lloyd-George ... 9
Barter trade ... 41, 44, 79, 80
British Starvation blockade ... 29, 31
Czecho-Slovakia, center of anti-German agitation ... 40
Encirclement ... 9
Great Britain, see
Jews, 37, 38, 40, 48, 52, 62, 68, 73, 74
League of Nations ... 24
Money Powers ... 63, 64, 78
Philippines ... 5
Potsdam ... 83
Pres. Roosevelt's War Plans 68
Versailles Treaty ... 32-6, 44
War against decided upon ... 57
War guilt ... 33-4
Zionism ... 21
Gohier, Urbain
La Vielle France ... 91-3
Great Britain
Aggression against the world 35
Aggression against the Boers ... 3, 93
Antagonism against America (Civil War) ... 1
Antagonism against Germany, 5, 11, 13, 41, 43, 80
Balance of power policy ... 14, 43, 76
Foreign armies conscripted ... (foot-note) 43
Japan and U. S. ... 59, 60, 63, 71
Jewry ... 19, 20, 26, 61, 73
Pre-World War I diplomacy ... 8
Sought to get U. S. into war against Germany by provoking Japan 63, 71
Trade war against Germany ... 41, 78
War and 19th century money ... 73, 78
Griffin, William, conversation with Churchill on American entry into World War I ... 16

H

Hague Conference ... 12
Henning, Arthur Scars ... 57
Herring, Hubert ... 49, 50
Herzl, Theodore ... 108
Von Hindenburg, President ... 38
Hitler
And Austria ... 40
And Chamberlian ... 54
Appointed Chancellor ... 38
Background of rise to power 31
Defied world financial monopoly ... 79
Hatred of, in America ... 52-3
Refugees allowed to leave ... 48
Restrictions on Jews brought war ... 74-5
Compared with British starvation blockade ... 29
Hobson, J. A.
British aggression against the Boer people ... 95
Holmes, John Haynes
Jews clamor for war ... 74
Holt, John B
Jewish restrictions in Germany compared with negro lynchings in U. S. ... 48
House, Col. Edw. Mandell ... 8
Howe, Quincy ... 49
Huddleston, Sisley ... 38
Hudson, R. S. ... 41-2, 44, 56
Huxley, Julian
Hoped for U. S. War with Japan ... 69

I

Internationalists elect Woodrow Wilson ... 18

J

Japan
England and Far East ... 59
England seeks to involve in war with U. S. ... 63
Pearl Harbor ... 69-70, 71
Jewish authorship, control of press and public opinion
Austria ... 105-6
England ... 98
Germany ... 37
South Africa ... 97
United States ... 40, 41, 52, 87
Jewish financiers and American Civil War ... 92
Jewish financiers in Germany and Austria ... 105
Jewish financiers and Woodrow Wilson ... 18
Jewish protective associations 84
Jewish revolutionaries ... 108
Jewish vote and Woodrow Wilson ... 18
Jewry influences Anglo-Saxon people ... 25, 26
Jewry declares war on Germany (1938) ... 39
Jewry for war against Germany (Potocki) ... 56
Jewry intimidates honest scholarship ... 47
Jewry influences Peace Conference (1919) ... 25, 26
Jewry and White Slave Traffic ... 37
Jews in American life ... 84
In England ... 61, 62
In Germany ... 29, 37, 39, 54, 62, 68
And Holy War ... 38, 47, 74
In Prague ... 40
South Africa ... 96-8
World War I ... 20, 21, 62
World War II ... 73
Johannesburg, New Jerusalem ... 96

K

Kent, Tyler ... 57
Keynes, J. M. ... 17
Korostovetz, Vladimir ... 37

L

Landman, Samuel ... 21
Great Britain, the Jews and Palestine ... 19
Langer, Senator Wm., on General Patton ... 89
Lansing, Robert
Peace Conference ... 22
Law, Bonar ... 17
Lazaron, Rabbi Morris ... 85
League of Nations ... 22, 23, 24
Lehman, Herbert ... 55
Lincoln, Abraham
Assassination ... 1, 76
International financiers ... 91
Livingston, Sigmund ... 67
Lloyd-George, David
On German Army ... 9, 10
Peace Treaty ... 32-3
Polish corridor ... 32
Louis XIV ... 35
Lyttleton, Oliver
Japan provoked into attacking Pearl Harbor ... 70

M

Marburg, Theodore ... 18
Mark, Jeffrey
World finance and war ... 75
Marshall, Gen. Geo. C., Bernard Baruch ... 74
War with Germany (1939) ... 74
Marx, Karl ... 26
McKinley, William ... 2
Monteiro, Manual de Goes
Gen. Marshall, Brazil and war with Germany (1939) ... 74
Morel, E. D. ... 9
Betrayal of Britain ... 13
Morgenthau, Henry, Sr. ... 18
Morgenthau, Henry, Jr. ... 55
Morgenthau Plan ... 18, 83
Morocco dispute ... 3
Munich Pact ... 54
Murry, J. Middleton
Social instability ... 99
Treaty of Versailles ... 24

N

Newspapers
Circulation press ... 89
Debauching people ... 100
Misrepresentations ... 97
World War I ... 15
Nichols, Beverly
British Empire and the Jews ... 61
Nicholson, Sir Arthur ... 33
Nicholson, Harold ... 33

O

Ohrbach, Nathan
Fund to preserve Jewish community ... 87
Orton, William
Twenty years armistice ... 27

P

Page, Kirby ... 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 33, 44
Paish, Sir George
To Get U. S. into war ... 50
Pan-Slavism ... 9
Patton, Gen. George ... 89
Peace Conference (1919) ... 22-25
Pearl Harbor ... 70, 71, 96
Pershing, Gen. John J. ... 7
Philippines ... 4, 5
Playne, C. E. ... 10
Polish Corridor, War Hazard
Austin Chamberlain ... 47
W. H. Dawson ... 106
Kirby Page ... 45
Polish Documents ... 50-57
Potocki, Jerzy ... 50, 52, 55
Prague, and Jewish Refugees ... 40
Pratt, Fletcher ... 45
Polish Documents ... 50
Public Opinion ... V, 27, 52, 63

R

Radziwill, Princess ... 8
Rathenau, Walter ... 103
Jews in German Life ... 39
Reed Douglas ... 40-44
Rhodes, Cecil ... 6
Rhodes Scholarship Fund ... 6
Rogerson, Sidney ... 49, 62
Roosevelt, Franklin D.
Atlantic Charter ... 69
Frontier on Rhine ... 46
War plans ... 50-55, 68
Roosevelt, Mrs. Franklin D.
Pearl Harbor ... 71
Roosevelt, Theodore ... 2
Morocco arbitration ... 3
Rothschilds ... 91
Russia
Pre-World W I diplomacy 8, 11

S

Sargent, Porter ... 49
Saturday Review
Germania delenda est ... 11
Sazanov ... 8, 11, 14
Schoonmaker, Edwin D. ... 12
Scrutton, Robert J.
Peace We Lost ... 77
Sheean, Vincent ... 52
de Siebert Collection ... 11
Smuts, Gen. Jan C.
British atrocities and the Boer people ... 93-5
Snow, John Howland ... 6, 27
Sombart, Werner
Jewish spirit ... 26
Stalin and
Liberal democracies ... 52
Liquidation of refugees ... 48
Starvation blockade of
Germany (1918) ... 29, 31
Stimson, Henry L. ... 69, 70
Stuttgart rapings ... 11
Swinton, John
American press ... 89
Sykes, Sir Mark ... 19, 20

T

Tedder, Sir Arthur
On total war ... 34
Thompson, Dorothy ... 52
Tilsit ... 8
Tirpitz, Admiral ... 11

U

Under Cover Forces
For War ... V, 90, 92, 95
United States
War with Spain ... 3, 4, 5
Untermeyer, Samuel
Holy War against
Germany ... 38, 47, 74

V

Versailles Treaty
British Starvation blockade 29
Iniquities of ... 44
Lord Carnock ... 33
No treaty ... 30
Results of ... 16
Voigt, F. A.
England and the Continent ... 76

W

Warburg, Paul
Federal Reserve System ... 76
War in Europe decided upon ... 57
Webbs ... 52
Wheeler-Bennett, J. W. ... 10
Wheeler, Senator Burton K. ... 50
White, Henry ... 12
White, William Allen
Reign of Terror ... 49

Von Wiegand, Karl
Bullitt and war in Europe ... 57
Potsdam declaration ... 82
Wilson, Woodrow
Justice Brandeis and the Zionists ... 19-21
Fourteen points ... 29
Col. House reports on war in Europe (1914) ... 8
Jewish financiers ... 18
Peace Conference ... 25
Wise, Jennings C. ... 18, 20, 21
Wise, Rabbi Stephen S.
Woodrow Wilson ... 18
Rabbi Lazaron incident ... 85
Wood, Gen. Robert
Churchill-smash Germany ... 67
Von Wrochem
Colored occupation troops ... 10

Z

Zionists ... 19, 20, 21

Books For Collateral Reading

The Revolution Was, Garet Garrett (1944), 51 pages..... $ .25*

Former Saturday Evening Post feature writer tells how the American government was captured from within.

Government By Treason, John Howland Snow (1946) 79 pages..... 1.00*

Exposes the treachery of Bretton Woods, the fraud of of the British "loan" and the give-away of countless billions of the Nation's wealth.

The Case of Tyler Kent, John Howland Snow (1946) 59 pages..... .50*

A detailed account of the pre-war cable exchange between Winston Churchill and President Roosevelt.

The Empire of "The City," E. C. Knuth (1946) 111 pages..... 1.00*

Traces the history of the imperialistic dictatorship which controls the foreign affairs of the United States, and the commerce, finances and politics of the world. (cloth $2.)

Democracy and World Dominion, Edwin D. Schoonmaker (1939), 331 pages..... 2.75

A survey of war fomenting world imperialism masked in the false front of "democracy."

Pearl Harbor, The Story of The Secret War, George Morgenstern (1947), 425 pages..... 3.00

This is a documented record of secret diplomacy and military intrigue which resulted in the catastrophe of December 7, 1941. Charles A. Beard calls Mr. Morgenstern's book a permanent contribution to the quest for an understanding of the tragedy at Pearl Harbor.

American Foreign Policy In Post-War Years (1935) Frank Simonds, 155 pages..... 2.00

A little known review of the interventionist American foreign policy by a well known author of realistic books on world affairs. This policy led to war as predicted. Should be in every library as ready reference to understand how the U. S. got where it is today.

American Foreign Policy In the Making, 1932-1940 (1946). A Study in Responsibilities, Charles A. Beard. 338 pages..... 4.00

A leading American historian surveys a foreign policy designed not to avoid war but covertly to get into it. Invaluable documentation.

America Goes To War, Charles C. Tansill (1938) 731 pages..... 5.00

Far and away the best analysis of American Neutrality and the road to war that has ever been written . . . and will necessitate a thorough rewriting of the history of the pre-war period—says Henry Steele Commager, commenting on this scholarly interpretation of the Neutrality policy of the American Government during the years 1914-1917.

Law of Civilization and Decay, Brooks Adams (1896), 1943 edition..... 3.50

With a long introduction by Charles A. Beard. Brooks Adams was one of the few scholarly Americans who threw off the fetters of liberal hypocritical idealism to show the real influences shaping the destiny of the world. (330 pages.)

Dynamics of War and Revolution, Lawrence Dennis (1941) 250 pages..... 3.00

As Brooks Adams was, Dennis is a present day realist who shuns hypocritical moralizing. A brilliant survey of political dynamics.

Trial On Trial, Maximilian St. George and Lawrence Dennis, 463 pages..... 5.00

A provocative analysis of the Second World War's most sensational political trial and exposure of the sinister Internationalist forces behind it. (1946).

History's Most Terrifying Peace, Austin J. App (1947) 107 pages..... 1.00*

Describes what "liberation" by the "Christian" Democracies has meant to Central Europe. All Americans should read this shameful record of betrayal by their elected government of the ideals for which they fought and ponder what they can do to restore American honor.

Gruesome Harvest, Ralph F. Keeling (1947), 140 pages..... 1.50*

An extensively documented survey of the costly attempt to exterminate the people of Germany.

Planned Famine, A. O. Tittmann (1947), 24 pages..... .20*

A brief survey of the Pan-British program to decimate the Teutonic peoples.

A New Social Philosophy, Werner Sombart (1934)
295 pages 3.50

The English translation of the book of this eminent German scholar enables Americans to understand a culture developed from an entirely different spirit than that from which their own commercial civilization has sprung.

Two new books by Jennings C. Wise, author of Woodrow Wilson, Disciple of Revolution:

America: The Background of Columbus 5.00

Traces the evolution of civilization down to the Christian era.

The Mystery of Columbus 5.00

Deals with the economic, political, social and religious forces influencing the discovery of the New World.
These two books have been hailed as: "A triumph of humanist culture over utilitarian erudition," by Baron Claude de Heeckeren D'Anthes, eminent elve of the Sorbonne.

The Servile State, Hilaire Belloc, 189 pages..... 2.50

First published in 1912, Belloc outlines the progressive economic enslavement of man by the destruction of private property through monopoly.

The Right to Work Versus Slavery, M. B. Pinkerton (1945), 110 pages..... .50*

A survey of the theories of Turgot and the Internationalist influences barring men and nations from the right to enjoy the fruits of their own toil.

An Exposition On the Secret Origins of Bolsevism, by Salluste ..... .60*

First American printing of this French scholar's revealing analysis of an influence disturbing world peace. A translation from the Revue de Paris.

The Anti-Defamation League And Its Use In The World Communist Offensive, by Robert H. Williams, 44 pages..... .35*

A picture of what more and more Americans regard with alarm, to be a secret police among us; and its relation to the world movement which threatens our civilization, reported by an Army Reserve Intelligence officer.

Medical Mussolini, Morris A. Bealle, 243 pages..... 3.00*

How Dr. Morris Fishbein, Director of the American Medical Association, has perverted the original intent of the founders and is helping to bring socialized medicine to the United States.

Washington Squirrel Cage, Morris A. Bealle (1946)
80 pages 2.00*

A factual story of the Washington Scene from 1933 to 1946 in breezy satire.

Take Your Choice—Separation or Mongrelization,
Senator Theodore G. Bilbo (330 pages)..... 3.00

The most thorough discussion of the race problem ever written. A plea for racial purity. A denunciation of miscegenation and mongrelization and a startling revelation about the equality campaign to integrate the negro into the social life of white America.

America—Which Way? John Howland Snow..... 1.00*

The authoritative source material packed into its 144 pages shows the way to clear thinking about the Communist menace to America. The first book to link imperialism with the Communist assault upon the world. An invaluable reference book.

---

*These books paper covered.

EXAMINER BOOKS
P. O. Box 144—Station Y
New York 21, N. Y.